

home. I haven't any money to buy flour with. Can you let me have—give me—I hate to ask it—50 cents to buy some flour to feed my wife and children?" He did not even have milk for his little children. He had no job.

I predict that if the Senate follows the advice of the Senators on the other side of the aisle and passes legislation such as that which is before us at the present time, there will be a recession. A strong economy cannot be built up in that way. There will be a recession; and after the recession, if the Democrats do not get back in control, there will be a depression. That is what will occur.

That is why I am fighting this legislation, because I believe that by doing so we do what is best for all the United States and what is best for building up a strong economy, whereby we shall be able to pay off the enormous debt of \$258,000,000,000. Mr. President, with this year's expenditures added to that debt, the total will be more than has been collected in taxes since the beginning of the United States. All the taxes do not amount to that much, plus this year's running expenses.

So we must keep up the income of this Nation if we are to save ourselves. We can bond ourselves, we can go into debt; there will be a stopping place unless we keep up the national income. We cannot cut it back in the good old Republican way and expect to meet our obligations that are outstanding at the present time.

Mr. President, it hurts me to think that the leaders of the United States cannot see those things and cannot appreciate them and cannot understand that bills of this nature are liable to bring chaos in their wake.

We hear much about Communists, Mr. President. If we ever go back to the days of 1933, with the enormous debt we now have, if anyone can tell me how to keep out of the hands of the Communists then, I should like to know it. That is the danger we are facing today; and we are putting wood on the fire when we pass such legislation as that which we have before us at this time. Mr. President, my wish is that God may guide the Senate in its vote on next Monday.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) on Saturday, June 21, 1947, the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 23, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of Hosts, who art the soul of the universe and the mind of man, we do not fear nor tremble in Thy presence. By infinite right, blessing, honor,

and glory belongeth unto Thee. We therefore praise Thee.

We are grateful, our Lord, that we live in a land of freemen, where opportunities and privileges give us food, clothing, and education. The past lives in the throbbing heart of the present. Grounded in the glorious liberty which is our blessed heritage, enable us to stand fast in the purpose of Thy will. Enjoin us that through grateful love of country, not coercion nor pressure, and without threat, we are enabled to preserve a sound and healthy America, without which there is little hope for the world. To this end we would fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty of man.

Through Christ our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House in the enrollment of the bill H. R. 3203 to make certain changes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1230. An act to amend sections 2 (a) and 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 254) entitled "An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MOORE, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. McGRATH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3203) entitled "An act relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations, to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 814) entitled "An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes."

TO AMEND SECTION 251 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 3444, to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to income from sources within possessions of the United States) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(1) Prisoners of war and internees: In the case of a citizen of the United States taken as a prisoner of war while serving within a possession of the United States as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, and in the case of a citizen interned by the enemy while serving as an employee within a possession of the United States—

"(1) If such citizen was confined in any place not within a possession of the United States, such place of confinement shall, for the purposes of this section, be considered as within a possession of the United States; and

"(2) any compensation received within the United States by such citizen attributable to the period of time during which such citizen was a prisoner of war or interned by the enemy shall, for the purposes of subsection (b), be considered as compensation received outside the United States."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 3444 is to restore to United States citizens certain legal rights and exemptions under the law when they became interned in Japanese prisons outside of the possession of the United States. It refers particularly to those engaged in trade and in the military and naval service in the Philippine Islands who were captured by the Japanese and incarcerated in prisons outside of the territory of the Philippine Islands.

Under a statute enacted about 1921 to encourage trade in the Philippine Islands, at a time when to be stationed there, or were there to establish a trade, was inimical to life and health, it was provided that persons engaged in trade or employed in business or trade should be relieved of the burden of their income tax provided that at least 80 percent of their income was derived from sources within a possession of the United States, and if at least 50 percent of their gross income was derived from the active conduct of a trade or business within a possession of the United States. Later, by regulations, this provision was expanded to include citizens serving in the military and naval forces of the United States who were stationed in the Philippine Islands.

When the "death march" started, several thousand American citizens were marched out of the Philippines by the Japanese at the point of a bayonet. They suffered indescribable indignities; some, of course, falling by the wayside from exhaustion never to recover. Under the 1921 law the income-tax exemption granted was denied to thousands of military people and civilians who were

incarcerated in prison outside the Philippine Islands. The exemption will continue to be denied to these unfortunate people unless H. R. 3444 is enacted into law.

What our people suffered at the hands of the Japanese in their prisons is best described in the book *The Three Came Home*, written by Mrs. Agnes Newton Keith, who with her husband and small child spent three and a half years in a Japanese prison camp. I quote from Mrs. Keith's book:

At the end of the first month the children came down with what we called dysentery, although no laboratory examination could be made. They became nauseated, had diarrhea, passed mucus and blood, and lay about the barracks very limply. Most of them were past the diaper age, and we had no provisions for stopping the wet ends. The camp became a trail of blood stools left in the wake of weeping children, who in their turn were followed by creeping infants who crawled through mud and gore. And after the infants would come some childless woman with dainty tread to report to the mother, "Mrs. So and So, your child has had an accident. Please clean it up."

But we had no waste cloths to clean anything up with. In addition to dysentery, they had influenza, they had worms, they had impetigo, they had malaria, and always they had colds. We didn't have medicines unless we smuggled, traded, or stole them. After a few months in camp I developed beriberi, a disease of undernourishment and vitamin deficiency. My legs and face swelled. By evening my legs were so numb that I could not stand on them. The doctor said I must eat all the green stuff I could get hold of. From there on throughout camp life I collected greens, ferns, weeds of any sort, and boiled and ate them.

H. R. 3444 has the approval of the Ways and Means Committee. I introduced this bill May 13, 1947, and I urge its passage in order to do justice to 30,000 of our service people and 10,000 civilians. The great sacrifices they made and the suffering they experienced in Japanese prison camps should not be aggravated by permitting their rights to be sacrificed at the point of Japanese bayonets. I am sure that there will be no objection or opposition to the passage of this bill by unanimous consent.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—PERMISSION TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight Saturday night to file certain reports on certain bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 334)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3020, the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

I am fully aware of the gravity which attaches to the exercise by the President of his constitutional power to withhold his approval from an enactment of the Congress.

I share with the Congress the conviction that legislation dealing with the relations between management and labor is necessary. I heartily condemn abuses on the part of unions and employers, and I have no patience with stubborn insistence on private advantage to the detriment of the public interest.

But this bill is far from a solution of these problems.

When one penetrates the complex, interwoven provisions of this omnibus bill, and understands the real meaning of its various parts, the result is startling.

The bill taken as a whole would reverse the basic direction of our national labor policy, inject the Government into private economic affairs on an unprecedented scale, and conflict with important principles of our democratic society. Its provisions would cause more strikes, not fewer. It would contribute neither to industrial peace nor to economic stability and progress. It would be a dangerous stride in the direction of a totally managed economy. It contains seeds of discord which would plague this Nation for years to come.

Because of the far-reaching import of this bill, I have weighed its probable effects against a series of fundamental considerations. In each case I find that the bill violates principles essential to our public welfare.

I. The first major test which I have applied to this bill is whether it would result in more or less Government intervention in our economic life.

Our basic national policy has always been to establish by law standards of fair dealing and then to leave the working of the economic system to the free choice of individuals. Under that policy of economic freedom we have built our Nation's productive strength. Our people have deep faith in industrial self-government with freedom of contract and free collective bargaining.

I find that this bill is completely contrary to that national policy of economic freedom. It would require the Government, in effect, to become an unwanted participant at every bargaining table. It would establish by law limitations on the terms of every bargaining agreement, and nullify thousands of agreements mutually arrived at and satisfactory to the parties. It would inject the Government deeply into the process by which employers and workers reach agreement. It would superimpose bureaucratic procedures on the free decisions of local employers and employees.

At a time when we are determined to remove, as rapidly as practicable, Federal controls established during the war, this bill would involve the Government in the free processes of our economic system to a degree unprecedented in peacetime.

This is a long step toward the settlement of economic issues by Government dictation. It is an indication that industrial relations are to be determined in the Halls of Congress and that political power is to supplant economic power as the critical factor in labor relations.

II. The second basic test against which I have measured this bill is whether it would improve human relations between employers and their employees.

Cooperation cannot be achieved by force of law. We cannot create mutual respect and confidence by legislative fiat.

I am convinced that this legislation overlooks the significance of these principles. It would encourage distrust, suspicion, and arbitrary attitudes.

I find that the National Labor Relations Act would be converted from an instrument with the major purpose of protecting the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively into a maze of pitfalls and complex procedures. As a result of these complexities employers and workers would find new barriers to mutual understanding.

The bill time and again would remove the settlement of differences from the bargaining table to courts of law. Instead of learning to live together, employers and unions are invited to engage in costly, time-consuming litigation, inevitably embittering both parties.

The Congress has, I think, paid too much attention to the inevitable frictions and difficulties incident to the re-conversion period. It has ignored the unmistakable evidence that those difficulties are receding and that labor-management cooperation is constantly improving. There is grave danger that this progress would be nullified through enactment of this legislation.

III. A third basic test is whether the bill is workable.

There is little point in putting laws on the books unless they can be executed. I have concluded that this bill would prove to be unworkable. The so-called emergency procedure for critical Nation-wide strikes would require an immense amount of Government effort but would result almost inevitably in failure. The National Labor Relations Board would be given many new tasks, and hobbled at every turn in attempting to carry them out. Unique restrictions on the Board's procedures would so greatly increase the backlog of unsettled cases that the parties might be driven to turn in despair from peaceful procedures to economic force.

IV. The fourth basic test by which I have measured this bill is the test of fairness.

The bill prescribes unequal penalties for the same offense. It would require the National Labor Relations Board to give priority to charges against workers over related charges against employers. It would discriminate against workers by arbitrarily penalizing them for all critical strikes.

Much has been made of the claim that the bill is intended simply to equalize the positions of labor and management. Careful analysis shows that this claim is unfounded. Many of the provisions of the bill standing alone seem innocent but, considered in relation to each other, reveal a consistent pattern of inequality.

The failure of the bill to meet these fundamental tests is clearly demonstrated by a more detailed consideration of its defects.

1. The bill would substantially increase strikes.

(1) It would discourage the growing willingness of unions to include "no strike" provisions in bargaining agreements, since any labor organization signing such an agreement would expose itself to suit for contract violation if any of its members engaged in an unauthorized "wildcat" strike.

(2) It would encourage strikes by imposing highly complex and burdensome reporting requirements on labor organizations which wish to avail themselves of their rights under the National Labor Relations Act. In connection with these reporting requirements, the bill would penalize unions for any failure to comply, no matter how inconsequential, by denying them all rights under the act. These provisions, which are irrelevant to the major purposes of the bill, seem peculiarly designed to place obstacles in the way of labor organizations which wish to appeal to the National Labor Relations Board for relief, and thus to impel them to strike or take other direct action.

(3) It would bring on strikes by depriving significant groups of workers of the right they now enjoy to organize and to bargain under the protection of law. For example, broad groups of employees who for purposes of the act would be classed as supervisors would be removed from the protection of the act. Such groups would be prevented from using peaceful machinery and would be left no option but the use of economic force.

(4) The bill would force unions to strike or to boycott if they wish to have a jurisdictional dispute settled by the National Labor Relations Board. This peculiar situation results from the fact that the Board is given authority to determine jurisdictional disputes over assignment of work only after such disputes have been converted into strikes or boycotts.

In addition to these ways in which specific provisions of the bill would lead directly to strikes, the cumulative effect of many of its other provisions which disrupt established relationships would result in industrial strife and unrest.

2. The bill arbitrarily decides, against the workers, certain issues which are normally the subject of collective bargaining, and thus restricts the area of voluntary agreement.

(1) The bill would limit the freedom of employers and labor organizations to agree on methods of developing responsibility on the part of unions by establishing union security. While seeming to preserve the right to agree to the union shop, it would place such a multitude of obstacles in the way of such agreement that union security and responsibility would be largely canceled.

In this respect, the bill disregards the voluntary developments in the field of industrial relations in the United States over the past 150 years. Today, over 11,000,000 workers are employed under some type of union-security contract. The great majority of the plants which have such union-security provisions have had few strikes. Employers in such plants are generally strong supporters of some type of union security, since it gives them a greater measure of stability in production.

(2) The bill would limit the freedom of employers and employees to establish and maintain welfare funds. It would prescribe arbitrary methods of administering them and rigidly limit the purposes for which they may be used. This is an undesirable intrusion by the Government into an important matter which should be the subject of private agreement between employers and employees.

(3) The bill presents the danger that employers and employees might be prohibited from agreeing on safety provisions, rest-period rules, and many other legitimate practices, since such practices may fall under the language defining "feather bedding."

3. The bill would expose employers to numerous hazards by which they could be annoyed and hampered.

(1) The bill would invite frequent disruption of continuous plant production by opening up immense possibilities for many more elections, and adding new types of elections. The bill would invite electioneering for changes in representatives and for union security. This would harass employers in their production efforts and would generate raiding and jurisdictional disputes. The National Labor Relations Board has been developing sound principles of stability on these matters. The bill would overturn these principles to the detriment of employers.

(2) The bill would complicate the collective bargaining process for employers by permitting—and in some cases requiring—the splitting up of stable patterns of representation. Employers would be harassed by having to deal with many small units. Labor organizations would be encouraged to engage in constant interunion warfare, which could result only in confusion.

(3) The bill would invite unions to sue employers in the courts regarding the thousands of minor grievances which arise every day over the interpretation of bargaining agreements. Employers are likely to be besieged by a multiplicity of minor suits, since management necessarily must take the initiative in applying the terms of agreements. In this respect, the bill ignores the fact that employers and unions are in wide agreement that the interpretation of the provisions of bargaining agreements should be submitted to the processes of negotiation ending in voluntary arbitration, under penalties prescribed in the agreement itself. This is one of the points on which the National Labor-Management Conference in November 1945, placed special emphasis. In introducing damage suits as a possible substitute for grievance machinery, the bill rejects entirely the informed wisdom of those experienced in labor relations.

(4) The bill would prevent an employer from freely granting a union-shop contract, even where he and virtually his entire working force were in agreement as to its desirability. He would be required to refrain from agreement until the National Labor Relations Board's work load permitted it to hold an election—in this case simply to ratify an unquestioned and legitimate agreement.

Employers, moreover, would suffer because the ability of unions to exercise re-

sponsibility under bargaining agreements would be diminished. Labor organizations whose disciplinary authority is weakened cannot carry their full share of maintaining stability of production.

4. The bill would deprive workers of vital protection which they now have under the law.

(1) The bill would make it easier for an employer to get rid of employees whom he wanted to discharge because they exercised their right of self-organization guaranteed by the act. It would permit an employer to dismiss a man on the pretext of a slight infraction of shop rules, even though his real motive was to discriminate against this employee for union activity.

(2) The bill would also put a powerful new weapon in the hands of employers by permitting them to initiate elections at times strategically advantageous to them. It is significant that employees on economic strike who may have been replaced are denied a vote. An employer could easily thwart the will of his employees by raising a question of representation at a time when the union was striking over contract terms.

(3) It would give employers the means to engage in endless litigation, draining the energy and resources of unions in court actions, even though the particular charges were groundless.

(4) It would deprive workers of the power to meet the competition of goods produced under sweatshop conditions by permitting employers to halt every type of secondary boycott, not merely those for unjustifiable purposes.

(5) It would reduce the responsibility of employers for unfair labor practices committed in their behalf. The effect of the bill is to narrow unfairly employer liability for antiunion acts and statements made by persons who, in the eyes of the employees affected, act and speak for management, but who may not be "agents" in the strict legal sense of that term.

(6) At the same time it would expose unions to suits for acts of violence, wildcat strikes, and other actions, none of which were authorized or ratified by them. By employing elaborate legal doctrine, the bill applies a superficially similar test of responsibility for employers and unions—each would be responsible for the acts of his agents. But the power of an employer to control the acts of his subordinates is direct and final. This is radically different from the power of unions to control the acts of their members—who are, after all, members of a free association.

5. The bill abounds in provisions which would be unduly burdensome or actually unworkable.

(1) The bill would erect an unworkable administrative structure for carrying out the National Labor Relations Act. The bill would establish, in effect, an independent general counsel and an independent Board. But it would place with the Board full responsibility for investigating and determining election cases—over 70 percent of the present case load—and at the same time would remove from the Board the authority to direct and control the personnel engaged in carrying out this responsibility.

(2) It would invite conflict between the National Labor Relations Board and its general counsel, since the general counsel would decide, without any right of appeal by employers and employees, whether charges were to be heard by the Board, and whether orders of the Board were to be referred to the court for enforcement. By virtue of this unlimited authority, a single administrative official might usurp the Board's responsibility for establishing policy under the act.

(3) It would strait-jacket the National Labor Relations Board's operations by a series of special restrictions unknown to any other quasi-judicial agency. After many years of study, the Congress adopted the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946 to govern the operation of all quasi-judicial agencies, including the National Labor Relations Board. This present bill disregards the Procedures Act and, in many respects, is directly contrary to the spirit and letter of that act. Simple and time-saving procedures, already established and accepted as desirable by employers and employees, would be summarily scrapped. The Board itself, denied the power of delegation, would be required to hear all jurisdictional disputes over work tasks. This single duty might require a major portion of the Board's time. The review function within the Board, largely of a nonjudicial character, would be split up and assigned to separate staffs attached to each Board member. This would lead to extensive and costly duplication of work and records.

(4) The bill would require or invite Government supervised elections in an endless variety of cases. Questions of the bargaining unit, of representatives, of union security, of bargaining offers, are subject to election after election, most of them completely unnecessary. The National Labor Relations Board has had difficulty conducting the number of elections required under present law. This bill would greatly multiply this load. It would, in effect, impose upon the Board a 5-year backlog of election cases, if it handled them at its present rate.

(5) The bill would introduce a unique handicap, unknown in ordinary law, upon the use of statements as evidence of unfair labor practices. An antiunion statement by an employer, for example, could not be considered as evidence of motive, unless it contained an explicit threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit. The bill would make it an unfair labor practice to "induce or encourage" certain types of strikes and boycotts, and then would forbid the National Labor Relations Board to consider as evidence "views, argument, or opinion" by which such a charge could be proved.

(6) The bill would require the Board to "determine" jurisdictional disputes over work tasks, instead of using arbitration, the accepted and traditional method of settling such disputes. In order to get its case before the Board a union must indulge in a strike or a boycott and wait for some other party to allege that it had violated the law. If the Board's decision should favor the party thus forced to violate the law in order that its case might be heard, the Board would be without power over other

parties to the dispute to whom the award might be unacceptable.

(7) The bill would require the Board to determine which employees on strike are "entitled to reinstatement" and hence would be eligible to vote in an election held during a strike. This would be an impossible task, since it would require the Board arbitrarily to decide which, if any, of the employees had been replaced and therefore should not be allowed to vote.

6. The bill would establish an ineffective and discriminatory emergency procedure for dealing with major strikes affecting the public health or safety.

This procedure would be certain to do more harm than good, and to increase rather than diminish widespread industrial disturbances. I am convinced that the country would be in for a bitter disappointment if these provisions of the bill became law.

The procedure laid down by the bill is elaborate. Its essential features are a Presidential board of inquiry, a waiting period of approximately 80 days—enforced by injunction—and a secret-ballot vote of the workers on the question of whether or not to accept their employer's last offer.

At the outset a board of inquiry would be required to investigate the situation thoroughly, but would be specifically forbidden to offer its informed judgment concerning a reasonable basis for settlement of the dispute. Such inquiry therefore, would serve merely as a sounding board to dramatize the respective positions of the parties.

A strike or lock-out might occur before the board of inquiry could make its report, and perhaps even before the board could be appointed. The existence of such a strike or lock-out would hamper the board in pursuing its inquiry. Experience has shown that fact-finding, if it is to be most effective as a device for settlement of labor disputes, should come before the men leave their work, not afterward. Furthermore, an injunction issued after a strike has started would arouse bitter resentment which would not contribute to agreement.

If the dispute had not been settled after 60 days of the waiting period, the National Labor Relations Board would be required to hold a separate election for the employees of each employer to find out whether the workers wished to accept the employer's last offer, as stated by him. Our experience under the War Labor Disputes Act showed conclusively that such an election would almost inevitably result in a vote to reject the employer's offer, since such action amounts to a vote of confidence by the workers in their bargaining representatives. The union would then be reinforced by a dramatic demonstration, under Government auspices, of its strength for further negotiations.

After this elaborate procedure the injunction would then have to be dissolved, the parties would be free to fight out their dispute, and it would be mandatory for the President to transfer the whole problem to the Congress, even if it were not in session. Thus, major eco-

nomie disputes between employers and their workers over contract terms might ultimately be thrown into the political arena for disposition. One could scarcely devise a less effective method for discouraging critical strikes.

This entire procedure is based upon the same erroneous assumptions as those which underlay the strike-vote provision of the War Labor Disputes Act, namely, that strikes are called in haste as the result of inflamed passions, and that union leaders do not represent the wishes of the workers. We have learned by experience, however, that strikes in the basic industries are not called in haste, but only after long periods of negotiation and serious deliberation; and that in the secret-ballot election the workers almost always vote to support their leaders.

Furthermore, a fundamental inequity runs through these provisions. The bill provides for injunctions to prohibit workers from striking, even against terms dictated by employers after contracts have expired. There is no provision assuring the protection of the rights of the employees during the period they are deprived of the right to protect themselves by economic action.

In summary, I find that the so-called "emergency procedure" would be ineffective. It would provide for clumsy and cumbersome Government intervention; it would authorize inequitable injunctions; and it would probably culminate in a public confession of failure. I cannot conceive that this procedure would aid in the settlement of disputes.

7. The bill would discriminate against employees.

(1) It would impose discriminatory penalties upon employers and employees for the same offense, that of violating the requirement that existing agreements be maintained for 60 days without strike or lock-out while a new agreement is being negotiated. Employers could only be required to restore the previous conditions of employment, but employees could be summarily dismissed by the employer.

(2) The bill would require the Board to seek a temporary restraining order when labor organizations had been charged with boycotts or certain kinds of jurisdictional strikes. It would invite employers to find any pretext for arguing that "an object" of the union's action was one of these practices, even though the primary object was fully legitimate. Moreover, since these cases would be taken directly into the courts, they necessarily would be settled by the judiciary before the National Labor Relations Board had a chance to decide the issue. This would thwart the entire purpose of the National Labor Relations Act in establishing the Board, which purpose was to confer on the Board, rather than the courts, the power to decide complex questions of fact in a special field requiring expert knowledge. This provision of the bill is clearly a backward step toward the old abuses of the labor injunction. No similar provision directed against employers can be found in the bill.

(3) The bill would also require the Board to give priority in investigating charges of certain kinds of unfair labor

practices against unions, even though such unfair labor practices might have been provoked by those of the employer. Thus the bill discriminates, in this regard, in the relief available to employers and unions.

(4) It would impose on labor organizations, but not on employers, burdensome reporting requirements which must be met before any rights would be available under the act.

(5) In weakening the protections afforded to the right to organize, contrary to the basic purpose of the National Labor Relations Act, the bill would injure smaller unions far more than larger ones. Those least able to protect themselves would be the principal victims of the bill.

8. The bill would disregard in important respects the unanimous convictions of employer and labor representatives at the national labor-management conference in November 1945.

(1) One of the strongest convictions expressed during the conference was that the Government should withdraw from the collective-bargaining process, now that the war emergency is over, and leave the determination of working conditions to the free agreement of the parties. This bill proceeds in exactly the opposite direction. In numerous ways the bill would unnecessarily intrude the Government into the process of reaching free decisions through bargaining. This intrusion is precisely what the representatives of management and labor resented.

(2) A unanimous recommendation of the conference was that the Conciliation Service should be strengthened within the Department of Labor. But this bill removes the Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor. The new name for the Service would carry with it no new dignity or new functions. The evidence does not support the theory that the conciliation function would be better exercised and protected by an independent agency outside the Department of Labor. Indeed, the Service would lose the important day-to-day support of factual research in industrial relations available from other units of the Department. Furthermore, the removal of the Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor would be contrary to the praiseworthy policy of the Congress to centralize related governmental units within the major Government departments.

9. The bill raises serious issues of public policy which transcend labor-management difficulties.

(1) In undertaking to restrict political contributions and expenditures, the bill would prohibit many legitimate activities on the part of unions and corporations. This provision would prevent the ordinary union newspaper from commenting favorably or unfavorably upon candidates or issues in national elections. I regard this as a dangerous intrusion on free speech, unwarranted by any demonstration of need, and quite foreign to the stated purposes of this bill.

Furthermore, this provision can be interpreted as going far beyond its apparent objectives, and as interfering with necessary business activities. It provides

no exemption for corporations whose business is the publication of newspapers or the operation of radio stations. It makes no distinctions between expenditures made by such corporations for the purpose of influencing the results of an election, and other expenditures made by them in the normal course of their business "in connection with" an election. Thus it would raise a host of troublesome questions concerning the legality of many practices ordinarily engaged in by newspapers and radio stations.

(2) In addition, in one important area the bill expressly abandons the principle of uniform application of national policy under Federal law. The bill's stated policy of preserving some degree of union security would be abdicated in all States where more restrictive policies exist. In other respects the bill makes clear that Federal policy would govern insofar as activities affecting commerce are concerned. This is not only an invitation to the States to distort national policy as they see fit, but is a complete forsaking of a long-standing constitutional principle.

(3) In regard to Communists in unions, I am convinced that the bill would have an effect exactly opposite to that intended by the Congress. Congress intended to assist labor organizations to rid themselves of Communist officers. With this objective I am in full accord. But the effect of this provision would be far different. The bill would deny the peaceful procedures of the National Labor Relations Act to a union unless all its officers declared under oath that they were not members of the Communist Party and that they did not favor the forcible or unconstitutional overthrow of the Government. The mere refusal by a single individual to sign the required affidavit would prevent an entire national labor union from being certified for purposes of collective bargaining. Such a union would have to win all its objectives by strike, rather than by orderly procedure under the law. The union and the affected industry would be disrupted for perhaps a long period of time while violent electioneering, charges, and countercharges split open the union ranks. The only result of this provision would be confusion and disorder, which is exactly the result the Communists desire.

This provision in the bill is an attempt to solve difficult problems of industrial democracy by recourse to oversimplified legal devices. I consider that this provision would increase, rather than decrease, disruptive effects of Communists in our labor movement.

The most fundamental test which I have applied to this bill is whether it would strengthen or weaken American democracy in the present critical hour. This bill is perhaps the most serious economic and social legislation of the past decade. Its effects—for good or ill—would be felt for decades to come.

I have concluded that the bill is a clear threat to the successful working of our democratic society.

One of the major lessons of recent world history is that free and vital trade-unions are a strong bulwark against the

growth of totalitarian movements. We must, therefore, be everlastingly alert that in striking at union abuses we do not destroy the contribution which unions make to our democratic strength.

This bill would go far toward weakening our trade-union movement. And it would go far toward destroying our national unity. By raising barriers between labor and management and by injecting political considerations into normal economic decisions, it would invite them to gain their ends through direct political action. I think it would be exceedingly dangerous to our country to develop a class basis for political action.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the transcendent importance of the United States in the world today as a force for freedom and peace. We cannot be strong internationally if our national unity and our productive strength are hindered at home. Anything which weakens our economy or weakens the unity of our people—as I am thoroughly convinced this bill would do—I cannot approve.

In my message on the state of the Union which I submitted to the Congress in January 1947, I recommended a step-by-step approach to the subject of labor legislation. I specifically indicated the problems which we should treat immediately. I recommended that, before going on to other problems, a careful, thorough, and nonpartisan investigation should be made, covering the entire field of labor-management relations.

The bill now before me reverses this procedure. It would make drastic changes in our national labor policy first, and would provide for investigation afterward.

There is still a genuine opportunity for the enactment of appropriate labor legislation this session. I still feel that the recommendations which I expressed in the state of the Union message constitute an adequate basis for legislation which is moderate in spirit and which relates to known abuses.

For the compelling reasons I have set forth, I return H. R. 3020 without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 20, 1947.

THE SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY].

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the contentions on both sides of this measure have been loud and long. It has been debated at greater length in the Congress, in the press, and over the radio than any other legislation in my memory. The veto message of the President raises no contention which has not been thoroughly explored and discussed. I do not see that any further debate will be material. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LESINSKI. I believe we are entitled to some time on this on the minority side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman insists on making the point of order that a quorum is not present, the Chair will accommodate him and count. [After counting.] Three hundred and forty Members are present, a quorum.

The previous question has been ordered.

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 331, nays 83, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—331

Abernethy	Colmer	Hall,
Albert	Cooley	Edwin Arthur
Allen, Calif.	Cooper	Hall,
Allen, Ill.	Corbett	Leonard W.
Allen, La.	Cotton	Halleck
Almond	Coudert	Hand
Andersen,	Courtney	Hardy
H. Carl	Cox	Harness, Ind.
Anderson, Calif.	Cravens	Harris
Andersen,	Crawford	Harrison
August H.	Crow	Hartley
Andrews, Ala.	Cunningham	Hays
Andrews, N. Y.	Curtis	Hébert
Arends	Dague	Hendricks
Arnold	Davis, Ga.	Herter
Auchincloss	Davis, Tenn.	Heseltan
Bakewell	Davis, Wis.	Hess
Banta	Dawson, Utah	Hill
Barden	Deane	Hinshaw
Barrett	Devitt	Hobbs
Bates, Mass.	D'Ewart	Hoeven
Battle	Dirksen	Hoffman
Beall	Domenegeaux	Holmes
Beckworth	Dondero	Hope
Bell	Dorn	Horan
Bender	Doughton	Howell
Bennett, Mo.	Drewry	Jackson, Calif.
Blackney	Durham	Jarman
Bland	Eaton	Jenison
Boggs, Del.	Elliott	Jenkins, Ohio
Boggs, La.	Ellis	Jenkins, Pa.
Bolton	Ellsworth	Jennings
Bonner	Elsasser	Jensen
Boykin	Elston	Johnson, Calif.
Bradley	Engel, Mich.	Johnson, Ill.
Bramblett	Engle, Calif.	Johnson, Ind.
Brehm	Evins	Johnson, Tex.
Brooks	Fallon	Jones, Ala.
Brown, Ga.	Fellows	Jones, N. C.
Brown, Ohio	Fenton	Jones, Ohio
Bryson	Fernandez	Jonkman
Buck	Fisher	Judd
Buffett	Fletcher	Kean
Bulwinkle	Foot	Kearney
Burke	Fulton	Kearns
Burleson	Gallagher	Keating
Busbey	Gamble	Keefe
Byrnes, Wis.	Gary	Kerr
Camp	Gathings	Kersten, Wis.
Canfield	Gavin	Kilburn
Carson	Gearhart	Kilday
Case, N. J.	Gillette	Knutson
Case, S. Dak.	Gillie	Kunkel
Chadwick	Goff	Landis
Chapman	Goodwin	Larcade
Chelf	Gore	Latham
Chenoweth	Gossett	Lea
Chiperfield	Graham	LeCompte
Church	Grant, Ala.	LeFevre
Clark	Grant, Ind.	Lewis
Clason	Gregory	Lodge
Clevenger	Griffiths	Love
Clippinger	Gross	Lucas
Coffin	Gwinn, N. Y.	Lyle
Cole, Kans.	Gwynne, Iowa	McConnell
Cole, Mo.	Hagen	McCown
Cole, N. Y.	Hale	McDonough

McDowell	Poage
McGarvey	Potts
McGregor	Poulson
McMahon	Preston
McMillen, Ill.	Price, Fla.
MacKinnon	Priest
Macy	Rains
Mahon	Ramey
Maloney	Rankin
Manasco	Redden
Martin, Iowa	Reed, Ill.
Mason	Reed, N. Y.
Mathews	Rees
Meade, Ky.	Reeves
Meade, Md.	Rich
Morrow	Richards
Meyer	Riehlman
Michener	Riley
Miller, Conn.	Rivers
Miller, Md.	Rizley
Miller, Nebr.	Robertson
Mills	Robison
Mitchell	Rockwell
Monroney	Rogers, Fla.
Morton	Rogers, Mass.
Muhlenberg	Rohrbough
Mundt	Ross
Murray, Tenn.	Russell
Murray, Wis.	Sadiak
Nixon	St. George
Nodar	Sanborn
Norblad	Sarbacher
Norrell	Sasscer
O'Hara	Schwabe, Mo.
O'Konski	Schwabe, Okla.
Owens	Scoblick
Pace	Scott, Hardie
Passman	Scott,
Patterson	Hugh D., Jr.
Peden	Scrivner
Peterson	Seely-Brown
Phillips, Calif.	Shafer
Pickett	Short
Ploesser	Sikes
Plumley	Simpson, Ill.

NAYS—83

Angell	Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Calif.
Bates, Ky.	Hart	Morgan
Bishop	Havener	Morris
Blatnik	Hedrick	Morrison
Bloom	Heffernan	Murdock
Brophy	Hollifield	Norton
Buchanan	Huber	O'Brien
Buckley	Hull	O'Toole
Butler	Jackson, Wash.	Pfeifer
Byrne, N. Y.	Javits	Phillips, Tenn.
Cannon	Johnson, Okla.	Price, Ill.
Carroll	Jones, Wash.	Rabin
Celler	Karsten, Mo.	Rayburn
Clements	Kee	Rayfiel
Crosser	Kennedy	Rooney
Dawson, Ill.	Keogh	Sabath
Deaney	King	Sadowski
Dingell	Kirwan	Sheppard
Donohue	Klein	Somers
Douglas	Lane	Spence
Eberhart	Lanham	Thomas, Tex.
Feighan	Lemke	Thomason
Flannagan	Lesinski	Tollefson
Fogarty	Lynch	Walter
Folger	McCormack	Welch
Forand	Madden	
Gordon	Mansfield,	
Gorski	Mont.	
Granger	Marcantonio	

NOT VOTING—15

Bennett, Mich.	Kefauver	Patman
Combs	Kelley	Powell
Dolliver	Lusk	Smith, Ohio
Fuller	McMillan, S. C.	Van Zandt
Gifford	Mansfield, Tex.	Winstead

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Van Zandt and Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. Gifford and Mr. McMillan of South Carolina for, with Mr. Kelley against.

Mr. Fuller and Mrs. Lusk for, with Mr. Powell against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Winstead.

Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Combs.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago we listened to the reading of the veto message of the President upon H. R. 3020, the Labor-Management Relations Act. Immediately following the reading of the message, as provided by law, the roll was called. The question submitted was, Shall the House pass the bill notwithstanding the veto? Three hundred and thirty-one voted "aye," and 83 voted "no"—4 to 1. Only 71 Democrats voted to sustain the veto—4 to 1 to override the veto.

The President states:

I share with the Congress the conviction that legislation dealing with the relations between management and labor is necessary. I heartily condemn abuses on the part of unions and employers, and I have no patience with stubborn insistence on private advantage to the detriment of the public interest.

The President agrees with the Congress that legislation was and is necessary and that three groups have a vital interest in the legislation—labor, management, and the American people as a whole. I have always insisted that—

First. Labor has rights that should be and must be respected and protected.

Second. Management has rights that should be and must be respected and protected.

Third. The American people as a whole have rights that should be and must be respected and protected.

I have always believed that the workers of this country should have the right to organize to protect their just rights and interests and the right to bargain collectively with management and to have that high standard of wages that will make it possible for them and their families to maintain the high American standard of living for themselves and their families, and, proper working conditions and reasonable hours and also the protection of their health and old-age requirements. Every fair-minded consumer should be willing to pay such sum for food, clothing, shelter, and other goods and materials as will enable the producers to pay real American wages and a reasonable profit to those whose money is invested.

Many persons have the notion that Members of the House and Senate were born with a silver or a gold spoon in their mouths. This is not true. I am informed that more than 85 percent of the Members of the House and Senate earned their living and got their start in life by working with their hands. They came from the homes of families with few opportunities or from the great middle class of this country. They know what it means to toil on the farms, in the shops, mills, mines, and on the railroads of our country. I was born the son of a tenant farmer and worked in carshops, foundries, on the farm and the saw-mills, in the log woods and at anything that I could find to do with my hands

that was honorable. For the most part, I did my own cooking and washing while trying to secure some education. I think I know something about the viewpoint of those who toil. In all of my years of practice of the law, I never took a case against an injured worker or against the widow and orphan of a deceased worker.

This bill was not written by a lot of corporation lawyers. It is the result of the efforts of a committee of the House that held hearings for more than 6 weeks and all those who desired to be heard were heard, giving to this committee facts and views. This included of course the workers and their representatives, management and its representatives, and many persons in every walk of life. The committee then considered the bill for weeks. The bill was considered for many days in the House. Every line of the bill was read, many amendments were offered and some were adopted and many speeches were made by each and every Member of the House who desired to express his or her views. On a roll call, the House then passed the bill by a vote of 307 to 108. The bill then went to the Senate where it was considered by a Senate committee and then on the floor of the Senate and I am glad to say that it was greatly modified in the Senate. I was frank to say that I was not for the Hartley bill as it was written and would have voted against it had it been the bill that was submitted for final consideration. The Senate, after many days of consideration, and after many amendments were offered and many were adopted, passed the bill on a record vote by an overwhelming majority. As there were differences between the House and Senate bills, they were referred to a conference committee, made up of 5 Senators and 5 Representatives from the appropriate committees of the House and Senate, and after long consideration, the conferees of the House and Senate submitted the final compromise bill. The conference report was considered in the House and adopted by a record vote of approximately 4 to 1. A majority of Democrats, as well as Republicans, voted for the compromise bill, in the Senate, and that is the bill that went to President Truman for his consideration and that is the bill that was vetoed today by the President and passed by the House by a vote of 4 to 1. I know of no piece of legislation that has received more thorough consideration, every word and every line in the bill, as this bill.

Now, the President in his veto message, undertakes to say that everything in the bill is wrong. In all of my years of service in the House and Senate, I have never read a veto message that was so unfair and that had so little regard for the facts and for reason, commonsense, and justice as this veto message. I am led to wonder if the President ever had the time or took the time to read this bill which they say contains scores of pages. Who wrote the veto message? I said on the floor today that in my opinion this veto is a political message and that it would not have been made but for the fact that former Vice President Henry Wallace has been speaking throughout

the Nation to tremendous crowds who were paying from \$1 to \$3 to hear him speak, and in these speeches he was denouncing many of the policies of President Truman and was favoring a third party. This veto message, in my opinion, is an effort on the part of President Truman to appease the apparent strong following of Mr. Wallace, especially the radical element of that following and turn them away from Wallace to President Truman. He and his leaders, of course, realize the threat to his chances next year if Mr. Wallace continues in this course.

But, according to Mr. Truman, there is nothing good in this bill. There is no doubt but what the Members of the House and Senate have had one real purpose in mind and that is to bring out a bill that will be fair to management and labor and at the same time, protect the interest of the American people as a whole and promote the welfare of our Nation.

LEGISLATION NECESSARY

In his veto message, the President said that legislation was necessary. That appears to be the opinion of approximately 85 percent of the American people according to the Nation-wide polls taken and the Congress is in general agreement with the President that legislation is necessary, not only to bring about more just and fair relations between labor and management, but also in the interest of the American people as a whole. What is the record on this matter?

The records of the Government show that for the 6-year period before the adoption of NIRA—Blue Eagle—there was an average each year of 700 strikes involving on an average 270,000 workers. This average increased from year to year so that by the year of 1946 there were 4,985 strikes involving millions of workers with 119,000,000 man-days lost. We had a number of disastrous strikes last year which resulted in loss of billions in wages to the workers, tremendous losses to management, a curtailment of production and great inconvenience and loss to America. It is believed that all the fundamental essential rights of the workers have been preserved in this bill and it provides for equal justice between management and labor. It, in my opinion, strengthens conciliation and mediation of the differences between management and labor and if both sides will keep always before them the Golden Rule and realize fully what it means to be an American and have a part in this great country and what their joint efforts can do not only for themselves and for the American people, and be men of "good will" and not "ill will," I am very hopeful that this measure will benefit them and the American people as a whole. No one can claim perfection of this bill or any other bill of such vast importance. This bill provides that there shall be a thorough study made of this whole problem of labor-management relations in the hope that if the Congress has not done the best thing that could be done, that amendments may in due

course correct whatever may be inequitable or unfair either to labor or management.

It grieves me very much that after so much sincere, honest, and faithful work has been put upon a bill that the President denounces all of this work, denounces the bill in toto, says it is all wrong and undertakes to say that the overwhelming majority of Congress has labored without results. The President seems deeply concerned about the workers. He had an opportunity the other day to sign a bill that passed the House by more than 3 to 1 and in the Senate by nearly 2 to 1 granting a 30-percent tax reduction to approximately 30,000,000 low-income taxpayers. These were largely made up of working people, teachers, and so forth. It would give considerably more relief than the 30 percent to 1,500,000 persons 65 years of age or over. It only gives 20-percent relief to the 17,000,000 more income-tax payers in the middle income brackets and 10½ percent to less than 1,000 of the top income-tax payers. The President could also do a lot for labor in bringing down prices of food, clothing, and so forth. Under his policy we are stripping this country of its meat, corn, wheat, fruits, clothing, equipment, and other supplies and shipping them to foreign countries either as gifts or on credits extended by our country, but which will never be repaid. With this money we are loaning to them they come into our country and our markets and compete with our own consumers and up goes the prices of almost everything we consume. Why does not the President show a little more concern in this regard for American workers?

THE RAILROAD LABOR ACT

This bill does not cover railroad workers, but the bill vetoed today in many respects follows the Railroad Adjustment Acts that were passed with the cooperation of the railroad workers of the Nation, and which acts have proved to be the finest and most satisfactory labor laws ever passed by the Congress. It was urged that the Hartley-Taft bill requires a cooling-off period where differences arising between labor and management in industries cause the stoppage of work which would endanger the public health and security of our Nation. This provision does not apply to the health and security of a community, but to the public health and security of the Nation as a whole. If either management or labor plans to have a shut-down of an industry when such action will impair the national health and national security, what reasonable man would not be in favor of a cooling-off period and give the parties ample opportunity to try to adjust their differences themselves with the aid of the mediation and conciliation services of the Government which is set up as an independent agency by this bill? It seems that such action would be in the interest not only of management but of labor as well, and in the interest of the health and security of our country. It is a very serious matter in peace or war for one of our great

Nation-wide industries to close down abruptly. It of course means a great loss and hardship not only to the particular hundreds of thousands or millions of laborers involved, but it is a real threat to the security of this country and the health of the people of the Nation as a whole; but this bill expressly provides that any worker can quit his work at any time; and it also expressly provides that no man may be compelled to work against his will; and this, of course, is not a slave bill and it violates no law of this country against slavery or forced labor. When a railroad or other industry or utility closes down, that threatens the health or security of the Nation as a whole; that not only stops that particular industry, but it closes down thousands of factories, shops, and mills and perhaps will throw several million people out of work who were in no way responsible for the shutdown of this particular industry; and, of course, it will affect the hospitals, the schools, the churches, the homes, and the activity of millions of Americans, and threaten their health and security.

This bill eliminates the so-called closed shop. The railroad adjustment acts that have worked so well do the very same thing. It has been in the law since the Railroad Adjustment Act was first passed more than 25 years ago. In fact, those acts expressly forbid the closed shop and the railroad workers, as a general rule throughout the Nation, have themselves opposed the so-called closed shop and the railroad workers have never asked for or been granted the check-off system. Membership in the railroad brotherhoods is entirely voluntary. I have talked with many of them and they claim that they try to run their organizations and make them so attractive that railroad workers will want to belong to them and receive the benefits provided by law. Many polls within the last year or two of the American people and also of organized labor have expressed opposition to the closed shop. In fact only 8 percent of the American people favor closed shops, and a majority of the union workers have expressed themselves against the closed shop.

This bill provides for a union shop and the right to bargain collectively through bargaining agents chosen by the workers themselves. It provides that if 51 percent of the workers in any shop or plant or industry express a desire to form a union shop they have the authority and right under this bill to form such a union shop and select their collective bargaining agent.

THE GOVERNMENT BY INJUNCTION

It has been urged that this bill authorizes the issue of an injunction in any and all cases. This is not true. The use of the injunction, in my opinion, is more limited than it is under the present law. It does permit the Federal Government to issue an injunction in cases where there is or about to be a stoppage of work in an industry which threatens the public health and security of the Nation. It must be in a Nation-wide dispute and

it must be clearly shown to the court that the public health and security of the Nation are threatened. This injunctive proceeding is a matter of temporary relief. The purpose of it is to hold matters in abeyance until the differences may be adjusted by collective bargaining, and if this fails, to try to reach a settlement through independent conciliation and mediation boards that are provided for in this bill, and this injunctive process cannot be held for more than 80 days. This does not prevent, however, any worker from quitting his job at any time he may desire.

Where the disputes or differences arise in plants or industry that do not affect the public health or security, every opportunity and right is given to labor and management to adjust their own differences and, of course, in such cases some stoppages of work may be extended over a considerable period of time. It is the hope of the Congress that labor and management will, more in the future than in the past, respect the rights and the self-interest of their joint undertakings. Labor and management has always reminded me of a good team of horses. Where they pull together, the equipment is preserved and the load is moved. Where one horse starts to pull while the other balks, the equipment and harness are generally broken and torn and the load is not moved. Labor needs the jobs and the pay. Management cannot get along without labor. Great prosperity and unusual benefits are the rewards of management and labor when they pull together. Loss, misery, and unhappiness are the fruits of discord.

GOOD WILL AND ILL WILL

The Congress here has done its very best to pass a law that will do the job for men of good will, both of labor and management. It will improve present conditions if labor and management are of good will. No law on labor and management relations can be passed by Congress that will work successfully if those engaged in each group are men of ill will. Each group must bear in mind all the time that one cannot get along without the other and that their failure to make the most of their opportunities and get along result in loss to themselves and great loss to their neighbors and to their fellow Americans. Many of the important labor leaders of the country for some years have expressed great concern about the so-called jurisdictional strikes and sympathy strikes but these labor leaders have expressed the opinion generally that they have worked hard to cut out jurisdictional and sympathy strikes and that they will continue to do so, but they seem to be unable to carry out this purpose. President Truman has expressed disapproval of jurisdictional and sympathy strikes. A study of the facts show some interesting and almost unbelievable situations arising daily in this country by reason of jurisdictional and sympathy strikes. These disputes and strikes often occur in one or more of our large labor unions, one branch of the union striking against another branch of the same union, and sometimes the members of

one great union strike against the action of another union. For instance, there has come to our attention that building equipment manufactured in a union shop where management and labor were getting along happily had been sent to some city to be installed in buildings and homes. These buildings were being constructed by union men belonging to another union and they refused to install this equipment and finish constructing the job because the equipment was manufactured by union men of a different union. It is surprising how many instances there are of this kind.

Now, there are the contractors and owners of this construction who must lie idly by because of this unusual and unfair, and I might say un-American, situation. Again some differences may arise in a union shop between management and labor, and the workers strike. While that strike is in progress the union men in some other part of the country belonging to a different union go on a so-called sympathy strike. The men in the latter shop have a good union contract and are getting along without any trouble with management. These two types of strikes are outlawed and if this law is followed and is properly administered, many strikes will be eliminated.

CONTRACT RESPONSIBILITY

For a number of years high, responsible labor leaders have stated over and over that they believe in the observance of contracts by both parties. One of the purposes of organizing and collective bargaining is to make a contract by management and the workers. This bill provides that management and labor each shall fairly and honestly live up to the terms of their contract and if either party breaks the contract and the other suffers loss or damage thereby, the party who is at fault must respond in fair and just damages. If the parties do not intend to live up to their contract, why should they take the time, trouble, and incur expense of making a contract? Ever since I have been old enough to know anything I have always believed that each party should keep his or her contract if it is reasonably possible to do so. It seems to me that this is simply old-fashioned honesty and square dealing. Of course, times are flush now and employment is plentiful but the time may soon come when conditions change and management may find it convenient to close down their plant and break their 1-year or 2-year collective-bargaining contract with their workers and shut down the plant and throw the workers out of employment. Would not the workers then be very glad to have a provision in the law that would protect them from any such conduct on the part of management?

FORBIDS VIOLENCE BY EITHER PARTY

This bill would protect the workers against unfair treatment and violence on the part of management and at the same time it would prohibit violence and the unlawful destruction of property on the part of workers. That is now the law, and it has always been the law in this country and, in this connection, this bill

is opposed to the so-called mass picketing. It preserves the right of the workers to engage in peaceful picketing. The courts of this country have denounced mass-picketing and violence. There have been cases in this country where literally thousands of persons have picketed a plant and engaged in violence. In my honest opinion, labor nor management never did help its cause by engaging in lawlessness, violence, and the destruction of the property of others, and under this bill and the law the company cannot mistreat, browbeat and engage in violence and lawlessness against the workers.

This measure undertakes to provide fair treatment and protection for both labor and management in all of their relations to each other. The workers are allowed a union shop provided a majority of the workers vote for it. The polls show a majority of the union workers favor the union shop, but not the closed shop. Industry-wide bargaining is authorized. It is necessary in many of our Nation-wide industries. Welfare funds are allowed if jointly controlled by labor and management. This does not prohibit welfare funds heretofore created by collective bargaining. Union workers under this bill have greater rights and greater protection in their unions than they have under the present law. Supervisors, those who have the right to hire and fire and direct workers, are permitted to form and join unions, but they are not covered by the Wagner Act. The workers have the right to a secret vote as to whether they will accept the last offer by their employer. These elections are generally conducted by the Director of Mediation and Conciliation. The union cannot have so-called subversive union officers. It is found that Communists and other subversive groups have wormed their way into Government offices, the churches, labor unions, and other American organizations. This would mean the Congress is trying to aid the unions in ridding themselves of Communists.

FORBIDS EXPENDITURE OF STOCKHOLDER OR UNION FUNDS

This bill makes it unlawful for the officers of any corporation or business association to expend the funds of such corporation or association for political purposes for the election of a President, Vice President, Senator, or Representative. These funds belong to the stockholders, and the officers have been forbidden by law for years from using the stockholders' funds in an election for these Federal officers. This bill applies that same law to the officers of a labor union. They cannot use the funds of a labor union to aid in the election of Federal officers—President, Vice President, Senator, and Representative. These funds belong to the members of the union. The Congress is of the opinion that it is unfair to the members to use their funds to elect Federal officeholders. It was generally the case of some of the officers of the corporations or business associations belong to different political groups and not interested in the same man or party and, therefore, the law says that the officers cannot use the funds of

these stockholders as it is in many cases to help elect men to office who are opposed by the stockholders or some of them. In almost every instance part of the members of the union favor one particular candidate or party while the other members are opposed to such candidate or party, and the question arises—Is it fair for some two or three officers of that union to use the funds to help elect their particular candidate or candidates and use the money against the candidate or party of the other members? The President urged that this provision is unfair to both labor and management and that we have no right to pass such a law. The laws as to corporations and associations have been on the books for many years. This will not prevent the publishers of labor papers and editors of such papers from expressing themselves freely whether they are a journal of business or labor. All of the lodges that I know anything about forbid the use of the funds of the lodge to aid any candidate or party. There again the funds belong to the members of the lodge and there is usually a division as to their political affiliations.

I might say that during all of my years of service I have never called on any business concern or labor organization to put any money into my campaign, and so far as I know they have never done so. They have at times spoken complimentary of me and my record in their journals, and I think they have under this bill the right to do whatever they have done for me heretofore.

This, of course, does not limit in any way any officer or stockholder or any officer or member of a labor union from making such contributions out of his or her funds as is now provided by law to the candidate or party of his or her choice. The limitations of expenditures of the funds of corporations and others should have but one purpose and that is to make our elections as fair and clean as possible. I never heard one of our labor friends complain because the law forbids officers of corporations and business associations from making contributions to candidates or parties. All of us have agreed that has always been a good law as the great corporations could outspend the labor groups or individuals.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a survey by Kentucky veterans. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the Record and will cost \$568, but I ask that it be printed, notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial appearing in Foreign Commerce Weekly.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

Record regarding a bill he is introducing today.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article appearing in a New York newspaper.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a speech by Eric Johnston before the Young Men's Republican Club at Milwaukee and an editorial.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include extraneous matter.

WHITE HOUSE COOPERATION NEEDED

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much during the past 6 or 7 months about cooperation, and working together harmoniously. I fail to see where we are getting any cooperation whatsoever from the White House. It seems strange to me when the House of Representatives by a vote of 331 to 83 voted to override a Presidential veto, as it did this afternoon, that such a great majority would be wrong and the Chief Executive and 83 Members right. The Chief Executive seems to think he is the only one who is right. His promise to cooperate with the Republican House and the Republican Senate has gone out the window, and the only way the American people may hope for cooperation is to put somebody in the White House who will cooperate with the majority of the Members of the House and Senate of the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of the Truman foreign policy and include an editorial on the same subject.

Mr. ROBSION asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record following the action on the veto and include some extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record on two subjects and include certain excerpts in each.

THE LABOR BILL

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, we heard the message of the President urging us to kill the labor bill, and the House on a record vote here has voted 331 to override the President's veto and

83 in support of his veto. Only 73 Democrats voted to sustain the veto. I do not think we ought to be too hard on President Truman. He has had some hard problems, and his hardest problem is not in this labor bill, it is Henry Wallace. The vetoes on the tax bill and on this labor bill in my honest judgment are an effort to stop Henry Wallace. Former Vice President Wallace has been speaking to great audiences throughout the country, ranging from 5,000 to 30,000 people and the press reports that persons are paying from \$1 to \$3 to hear him speak. In these speeches, he vigorously criticized many of the Truman policies and has strongly indicated that he favors a third party. He spoke to a large audience here in Washington last Monday night and repeated his criticisms and stated more definitely his position on a third party.

Mr. Wallace's activity has caused Democratic leaders here and over the Nation to get busy and they have been urging the President to veto the tax-relief bill and the labor-management relations bill, and the President has now vetoed both bills. The tax bill failed by three votes to get a two-thirds majority, and 35 Democrats voted to override the veto on the tax bill and there will be no tax relief for the fifty million income taxpayers of America this year. The President's veto message on the labor-management bill disregarded the records and the facts and expressed opinions and stated conclusions that are certainly not supported by the record or the facts. I am strongly of the opinion, and I have heard many others express the same view, that he would not have vetoed either bill or submitted such an unfair and misleading veto message if he and many of his leaders were not deeply concerned over Mr. Wallace and his third party. Was he trying to take away the thunder and the supporters of Mr. Wallace? Only 73 Democrats were willing to follow and support the veto of the President. This bill could not have been passed over the President's veto by a 4-to-1 margin if it was not just and fair and supported by the record and the facts.

SHIPMENT OF OIL TO RUSSIA

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, news reports show that the loading of Russian tankers at San Pedro, Calif., is proceeding. The capacities of the 10 tankers which will carry our oil to the Russian naval base in Siberia indicate that the total amount of products will be in excess of one-half million barrels. Does this remind you of the days when oil and steel moved in great quantity to Japan?

Certain of the administration officials say our oil supply situation here is in precarious balance with demand, and that the utmost in good management is necessary to make the proper distribution of supplies. With one hand, we

send money abroad to prevent the extension of communism and with the other, we provide the mother country of communism with our goods.

There is a law on the books providing for controls of exports. The control on oil shipments was removed months ago by the controllers. They were given authority to apply controls, or take them off as they pleased. I understand, it is an exercise of administrative will that oil is being permitted to go to Russia.

The administration is asking for a renewal of the authority. What better proof can be supplied of the dangers of unchecked discretion than the failure to apply the controls to diversion of our oil supply to Russia.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] has just made a disturbing observation relative to shipments of great quantities of oil to Russia, just revealed by the press. As chairman of Subcommittee No. 3 of the Armed Services Committee, I rise at this time to assure the gentleman and all other Members that I intend to stop these shipments if it is humanly possible. I have already summoned officials of the Office of International Trade to appear before my subcommittee tomorrow morning to explain why such shipments of oil to Russia are being permitted in the face of an apparent shortage of oil in America.

Mr. Speaker, we have an Export Control Act which is intended to protect the American people against the shipping abroad of items in short supply in this country. The Office of International Trade is now seeking an extension of that act, which expires June 30. My committee has held hearings on a bill to extend the act and has reported it favorably. I appeared before the Rules Committee 2 days ago to bring it before the House.

During the hearings tomorrow I intend to ascertain why the Congress should continue the Export Control Act if the Office of International Trade does not do what the act intends. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, a report of my findings next Monday. And let me add, unless these shipments of oil to Russia are stopped, I shall withdraw my support of any effort to continue export controls.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN—THE TAX BILL AND THE LABOR BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania

[Mr. RICH] I desire to say that he is far wide of the mark when he accuses President Truman of not cooperating with Congress, merely because he exercised his official prerogative in vetoing the so-called labor bill.

I voted to override the veto, because I think the people of the entire country, including organized labor, will be better off if the measure becomes a law.

But that does not mean I would accuse the President of refusing to cooperate with Congress merely because he did not agree with me on this particular measure.

Harry Truman is one of the most conscientious men who ever occupied the White House, and I am sure he was sincere in the stand he took on this bill, even though I disagreed with him.

I voted to sustain him on the tax bill, for the simple reason that it took too much tax off the big taxpayers and not enough off the little ones.

But for the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSON] to say that Henry Wallace intimidated or frightened President Truman into vetoing these two bills is just about as ridiculous as it would be to accuse a jack rabbit of chasing a bulldog out of the field, or a lightning bug of dimming the rays of the noonday sun.

In addition to being one of the most conscientious men I have ever known, Harry Truman has as much courage as any man who has ever occupied the Presidency—at least during your lifetime and mine.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an address by Hon. W. F. NORRELL at the fifty-sixth commencement exercises of the College of the Ozarks on May 25, 1947.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a very interesting article.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a speech by Alexander Printz on Management Speaks to Labor.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Record in four instances and to include certain extraneous matter.

THE HOUSING BILL

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform the Members of the House that I have today placed on the Clerk's desk a petition to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of a resolution providing for the consideration of the long-range housing bill which has been introduced in the House of Representatives by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and in the other body by Messrs. TAFT, ELLENDER, and WAGNER.

Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly apparent that we are not going to have hearings on this bill. I do not mean at this moment to discuss the need for housing in the country. I think most of the Members are aware of the need for housing.

This bill will give Members an opportunity to show where they stand on this matter which is of the most vital importance to the people of America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

RELIGIOUS SITUATION IN EUROPE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Patterson, in arranging for a group of clergymen to tour Europe at Government expense and to report back on the religious situation in that part of the world, is playing into the hands of those who want to further appease Russia.

The Secretary has permitted the notoriously Red Bishop Oxnard, of the Federal Council of the Churches of America, to load down the mission with pro-Russians. While there are some good men in the group, the Oxnard crowd predominates, and it is a foregone conclusion that it will be a divided report that the group will make, which will provoke widespread controversy and do more harm than good.

I should like to know by what authority does Secretary Patterson authorize and arrange for this mischievous business? Is he taking over the functions of the Department of State, or is this a military mission? The trip should be canceled.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KERR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Evening Star of June 14, 1947, by J. G. Hayden.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a resolution.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of an editorial.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Senator WAGNER and a news article from the Syracuse Herald-Journal of May 22, 1947.

Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address recently made by Alexander Powell.

FOREIGN LIQUIDATION COMMISSION

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call the attention of the House to a very flagrant act on the part of the Foreign Liquidation Commission. One of my constituents complained of the treatment he had received after the transaction had occurred.

It was brought to my attention yesterday that bids had been heretofore requested looking toward the sale of part of the Canol property in Canada. One bid had been received, and the dead line for the effectiveness of the bid, as stated by the bidder, was 4 p. m. yesterday. My constituent, the second bidder, delivered his bid to the office of the Foreign Liquidation Commission about 3 p. m. yesterday. The bid was received and was in good order. Just a few minutes before 4 o'clock one of the bidders, while in one of the offices of the Foreign Liquidation Commission, received information by eavesdropping that his bid was \$25,000 low. He immediately changed his bid and bid \$1 more than the other bidder. Then this bid was accepted by the Foreign Liquidation Commission after 4 p. m.

The irregularities were called to the attention of Maj. Gen. Donald Connolly, Commissioner, and members of his staff of the Foreign Liquidation Commission who participated in the negotiations. They then threw out all bids, thus giving an opportunity to the eavesdropper to profit by his own unsavory conduct.

General Connolly and his staff took an uninterested attitude, and condoned the unfairness of the whole transaction by receiving the first bidder's changed bid after 4 p. m. had passed. I am wondering how many similar transactions have occurred like this where ordinary decency, fair play, and common honesty were ignored. I am also wondering whether this deal was cut and dried for the first bidder to get the award promptly at 4 p. m. This and other matters should be carefully investigated.

General Connolly's attitude is clearly in disregard of good business practices and fairness. No wonder the people are up in arms and are losing confidence in some of the Federal agencies. The general should resign his office immediately. And surely the Army should not take him back in good standing because his conduct has reflected upon his uniform and the two stars he wears. I have asked that an investigation be made of this transaction and of other transactions of the Foreign Liquidation Commission. The whole affair smells to high heaven.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, when the so-called Hartley bill, which was the original bill submitted to the House, was under consideration, I urged with all the sincerity at my command that it be rejected. At that time I informed the House that the bill was an ill-advised, poorly drafted, complex collection of thoroughly confusing policy considerations and unworkable administrative techniques. My opposition to the bill primarily was based on the fact that it would create rather than diminish industrial unrest and would ultimately lead to class warfare in our Nation.

Members of the House who have followed closely the press and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since that date are well aware that my position respecting the so-called Hartley bill found very substantial support in the editorial pages of the press of the Nation and, almost unanimous endorsement by students of industrial relations and the trade-labor movement. That bill was characterized with surprising unanimity as a harsh and a repressive measure that would lead to rather than avoid discord.

After the Senate enacted the so-called Taft bill, editorial comment, students of the subject of labor relations, even industrialists, members of the bar, and almost every informed group and association that commented characterized the Taft bill as a milder bill than the repressive Hartley bill. Comment was varied. Some had hopes; others fears. But at least it did not receive the condemnation that greeted the House bill.

After action by the Senate and the House, conferees of both chambers met and reached agreement on the so-called Taft-Hartley bill.

At the time this measure was before the House time did not permit me to call attention to the manner in which the so-called Taft bill had been made far more drastic and, indeed, very nearly as restrictive as the original Hartley bill.

Since passage by both Chambers of the conference bill, predictions that such a measure would result in industrial unrest and would be resented both by management and labor have been proved true. Witness the release of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which is made up of all the Catholic bishops of the United States, who, as everyone knows, have neither political motives nor special interests to serve. Theirs is an unbiased, scholarly, high-minded and ethical approach to the most dynamic, domestic issue of our times. Their interest is directed not toward any one segment of society, but their concern is the welfare and well-being of all the peoples at all times. Their statement, which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A2833, reflect my own views in a striking manner.

When the conference bill was last before the House, I was not permitted sufficient time to elaborate on my position and necessarily in the time permitted unhappily could only make limited observations to characterize the bill.

Although thereafter I reduced my position to writing with the intent of placing it in the RECORD, the statement by the National Catholic Welfare Conference so

accurately reflects my feelings and expresses them so pointedly that I can do nothing better than to adopt them as my own.

The President's message has said all that needs further to be said about the bill. If each of you will pause and reflect, if each of you will search your own hearts and minds, if each of you will weigh the serious implications of his message and its meaning to our domestic situation, our international situation, and the future of this great country, I think that you will conclude that today is not the time for hasty, ill-considered action on this subject and will take this opportunity to make haste slowly for the future generations to whom we owe so much. The Nation was blessed in its recent hour of crisis when labor and industry as a team, working in cooperation, accomplished miracles in the defense of democratic principles. Should the supreme misfortune of another such crisis confront this Nation, and God willing that it does not, our hope and our strength will be found in the hearts of our citizens and what we receive at that moment will be in direct proportion to the love and inspiration we find because of their feeling toward democracy. God willing, labor will still believe that it has a stake in America. Whether we inspire that feeling and belief is our choice today.

This is not to mean that labor has done no wrong, or is above reproach. There is a wide area in which corrective action is necessary—either by the house of labor itself or, if needs be, by the Congress. For many years I have informed the leaders of labor in America that the public will not long tolerate some of its practices, in particular the unnecessary boycotts and jurisdictional disputes; that so long as such conduct remains uncorrected by labor itself it will be the responsibility of Congress to take action in the interest of the public. But this measure goes too far—it strikes at the heart of collective bargaining. We cannot correct one wrong by committing another. We cannot remove the causes of industrial unrest by restricting the processes and agencies necessary to the adjustment of differences. If this measure corrected abuses only, I would support it. But I cannot, in the interest of correcting admitted abuses, join in further hampering the processes of collective bargaining.

I stand ready to support at any time any measure which will preserve collective bargaining and labor's rights but which will reach the abuses the President has so eloquently called to our attention. In the interest of America, it would be unwise to go further.

I consider the message of the President today one of the most constructive, courageous, and informative messages I have ever heard delivered to the Congress. I regret that his veto was not sustained. I hope the Senate will sustain his veto, and I predict that history will record that the best interests of America were served by the sound, courageous position taken by President Truman in vetoing H. R. 3020.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, President Truman, in his message vetoing H. R. 3020, known as the Taft-Hartley labor bill, delivered one of the most courageous and statesmanlike documents the Congress has received in a long time. Every American should read and study the President's veto message of this legislation.

Since the open hearings started on labor legislation in the Committee on Education and Labor February 5, volumes of propaganda has been sent over the country by newspapers and radio in an effort to prejudice the minds of the American people against labor unions generally. The strategy of this campaign was to drive a wedge between the labor union membership and its leadership. The facts and the true analysis of the final legislation which was passed by the Senate and House conferees has never been fully analyzed by the American public. If this legislation is enacted into law, it will not only set back labor's progress a quarter of a century, but it will promote industrial confusion and chaos in the heavy industries throughout the country.

President Truman, in his message, has clearly set out a number of provisions in this bill which will involve management and employees in highly complicated legal entanglements. One of the numerous involvements restrict even non-labor newspapers from recommending or participating in political campaigns. It is unfortunate that the conference report was brought in before the House 2 weeks ago and the membership was compelled to vote on the seventy-odd pages without any opportunity of studying its contents. Had the message which President Truman sent to Congress vetoing H. R. 3020 been delivered to the American people over a month ago, so as to acquaint the public with the facts, I believe this legislation could not have passed the House in its present form.

Several years ago the so-called Smith-Connally bill was passed in Congress under the same conditions of speed, propaganda, and public frenzy, but today even its congressional sponsors admit that that legislation was a mistake and contributed nothing to management-labor relations.

President Truman's message is a factual masterpiece and when the American people have digested the facts of this legislation, the repercussions against the Taft-Hartley bill will be astounding. My only fear is that if it becomes a law, industrial production will have to suffer a period of chaos, confusion and strife until this legislation is drastically amended or repealed. America cannot afford to go through this period during these critical times.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that no time was allowed to speak on the President's veto immediately after it was delivered, so I rise at this time in support of the President's veto of the pending Taft-Hartley bill.

On page 6383 of the RECORD dated June 4, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY], the sponsor of this legislation, stated on the floor when he brought in the conference report:

I call your attention to what is left in this bill, because I think you are going to find there is more in this bill than may meet the eye and may have been heretofore presented to you.

No truer words were ever spoken as anyone who has taken time to try and study this bill and conference report will know, because, in my opinion, should this bill become a law, it will be years before it will be clearly defined so that both labor and management will be able to understand it.

While there are some good and needed provisions in the Taft-Hartley bill, I have felt all along that the bill itself should have been divided into three sections: One to consider changes in the Wagner Act, and the other two dealing with the Conciliation Service and the emergency handling of utilities strikes affecting the national interest. Only by this means do I think any Member of Congress would have had a chance to understand the type of legislation voted on. As a matter of fact there was no attempt made in the House to divide the bill into sections so that we could achieve needed labor reforms this year. Furthermore, when the attempt was made in the Senate to consider the present labor bill in three sections, it was voted down by an overwhelming majority in that body. To me this indicated that the Congress was not interested so much in trying to enact legislation which would remedy the inequalities between labor and management but was in fact determined to pass an omnibus measure in which both good and bad legislation would be considered together and thereby create a situation which would bring no good to labor or management but in the long run would be detrimental to both.

Although there are some parts of the conference report having to do with needed reforms, which I approve, I cannot see my way clear to support this measure, because I feel strongly that the Taft-Hartley labor bill is unfair to organized labor and that the measure itself is a device for making unions so weak that they cannot carry out effective collective bargaining. The bill does not result in equalizing the rights of labor and management as it should, but under this measure management is given such an advantage over labor that it can prevent effective collective bargaining by unions.

The conference report was brought before the House and it was impossible for any Member to thoroughly analyze the 75 pages contained in it in the time allotted

to us. However, on the basis of my study—and I have gone through the report and the bill—I am completely convinced that it is an impractical and unadministrable law.

Virtually every amendment which has been made threatens the legitimate rights of the American workman, and the net effect is to discourage and stifle collective bargaining and to impede, if not make impossible, effective enforcement of the National Labor Relations Act.

Under the conference report every organizational drive by unions, every effort to achieve collective bargaining, and every strike could be met and defeated by destructive lawsuits in the courts.

In my opinion, any legislation that invites and encourages litigation over labor relations is not going to solve the problems of labor's unrest nor is it going to bring about harmonious relations between employees and employers.

Furthermore, although the contention made is that the Norris-LaGuardia Act is amended to bring about more favorable labor-management practices in effect and through indirection, the Norris-LaGuardia Act is set aside.

The measure passed by the House will be the cause of a series of United States Supreme Court decisions to interpret and iron out the ambiguities which run rampant throughout the entire measure. It will open wide the doors to employers to bring a multiplicity of suits which will empty the unions' treasuries because of the costs of litigations, and, in my further opinion, the act itself will be administratively unworkable.

Under this measure tremendous power has been given to the general counsel of the Board to administer this act and with such authority over the handling of labor-relations cases to such an extent that I do not think one man can handle the job nor do I think any one man should be entrusted with such a job.

The bill itself is unfair to labor. It is destructive of legitimate labor rights. In my opinion it will cause more labor strife and chaos and the net result will be, I repeat, not only injury to the American workman but in the long run injury to the American employer as well.

In addition to what I have already said, it forbids or removes collective bargaining on such vital issues as the closed shop, the union shop, the check-off system, health and welfare funds and it allows injunctions in a variety of situations.

It requires unions as a condition of seeking legal redress, to file reports so detailed and burdensome as to paralyze effective action. It makes it illegal for unions to expel from membership a labor spy or one who has stolen union funds or who has led wildcat strikes; it eliminates the power of unions to remain internally strong and united.

New provisions were put into the conference report which we were not allowed to debate even though points of order were raised against them. The Conciliation Service, despite its fine record, was removed from the Department of Labor. It leaves to the authorities in a State the question whether a Federal law shall be in effect in that State. It thus makes

possible that any State legislature may nullify an act of Congress by passing a law of a different effect. This is something entirely new and radical and, in my opinion, extremely ill-advised.

It forbids labor papers, supported by dues-paying union members to print anyone's voting record. This is a denial of freedom of the press and of free speech.

The way to industrial peace lies partly through collective bargaining on a plane of equality and partnership between labor and management and partly in a Government policy which will eliminate the cause of industrial conflict. Only a domestic program based on a good wage policy, the lowering of the cost of living coupled with full production and full employment can give America industrial peace. This Congress has not done anything to meet its real responsibilities in many fields affecting the ordinary workman, and the result is that the minimum wage remains at 40 cents an hour; the low-cost housing bills remain in committee; and the Labor Department has been starved for appropriations, with the result that child labor is on the increase, and the NLRB has a backlog of more than 5,000 cases.

No one really knows what this bill contains and no one, including the authors of this measure, have any idea of its full implications as has been aptly stated. If this bill is passed over the President's veto, it will give the lawyers of the country a field day, because practically every section of this act will have to be taken to the courts for final judgment. I am deeply sorry that the Congress has not seen fit to produce a bill which I could have consistently and conscientiously supported. I personally recognize the mistakes of labor as I recognize the mistakes of business too, but I do not see this bill as being any solution to the problem that it seeks to remedy. I shall, therefore, vote to uphold the President's veto.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article from the Washington Post by George Gallup, showing how the American people approved the action on the vote taken to defeat the tax bill.

VOTE TO OVERRIDE THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE LABOR BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but extend to the Republican Members my deep-felt sympathy, because I know that most of them voted to pass the labor bill over the President's veto against their desire and against their best judgment, but being driven by that strong, powerful machine—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that those words be taken down. He is accusing the Republicans of voting because of the orders of some machine.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman withdraw the words?

Mr. SABATH. Which? The word "strong" or the word "machine"? I will just change it to "organization."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I ask that the words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed in order.

Mr. SABATH. The strong organization that the Republican Party has; and, of course, I myself believe in an organization, but I believe in an organization that works in the interest of the people of the country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial from the State Journal, of Lansing, Mich.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include therein an article from the current issue of Newsweek.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an article from the United Farmer.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial from the Chicago Daily News.

PERMISSION TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file minority views on the bill H. R. 1639, the Employers Liability Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

SOPHISTRY OF THE VETO MESSAGE ON THE LABOR BILL

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, after very careful consideration of the veto message I have come to the conclusion that it contains more sophistry and more misrepresentation than any message I have listened to from the White House in the 10 years I have been here. I say and I think I can say it without successful contradiction that President Truman in this veto message out-Roosevelted Roosevelt in every sense of the word.

ILL-ADVISED SHIPMENTS OF OIL AND GAS TO RUSSIA

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. **O'KONSKI**. Mr. Speaker, this business of shipping oil to Russia is a matter that should be given more than passing consideration from this Congress. When we consider that the Treasury Procurement Division reports that Russia today has a reserve of oil and gas ready for use of 150,000,000 barrels and that the United States ranks fourth among the nations of the world in oil reserves ready for use, having only 50,000,000 barrels, meaning that Russia has three times more than us, I think we should pause and consider whether we should continue shipping oil and gas to Russia at the rate of a million barrels per month.

Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad. I am wondering if we are not mad already in shipping 1,000,000 barrels of oil and gas to Russia when they already have a reserve of 150,000,000 barrels and we rank fourth among the nations of the world with only 50,000,000 barrels.

There is something rotten-smelling in Washington and we ought to do something about it. There are plans being formulated to reinstitute gas rationing in our Nation. Think of it—rationing gas to American citizens and shipping 1,000,000 barrels per month to Russia.

RESERVES

According to Treasury Department reports Russia today has a reserve of processed ready to use fuel oil and gasoline of 150,000,000 barrels. Of all the nations of the world in reserve oil and gas ready to use the United States is fourth with 50,000,000 barrels. I repeat Russia is first with 150,000,000 barrels. In case of war today to fly planes, and run ships and tanks Russia has a reserve of 150,000,000 barrels and we the United States have only 50,000,000 barrels, yet we are shipping oil and gas to Russia.

RUSSIA'S DEMANDS TODAY AS COMPARED TO PREVIOUS

Incidentally Russia is requesting from us today more oil and gas than she requested during the war.

The heads of our military in a communication to the committees in Congress has warned that the supply of oil and gas in the United States is only enough for normal military peacetime operations. In fact many normal operations have been cut out because of the small supply of oil and gas in America. The tragedy is that if war broke out today our military could not meet the emergency. This communication brought out the shortage in America will be critical until we get oil in abundance from Persia.

Government officials in Washington are warning that in the next 30 days it may be necessary to ration gasoline in the United States of America. At the same time a week ago in a Los Angeles harbor a Russian tanker sailed with 50,000 barrels of gasoline and oil. A few days ago two more Russian tankers were loaded with an equal amount. Ten more

Russian tankers are waiting to be loaded with equal amounts in next 30 days. Almost 1,000,000 barrels in 30 days.

THE SHIPMENT OF OIL AND GAS TO RUSSIA

Mr. **PHILLIPS** of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include two clippings from the Chicago Journal of Commerce of June 17.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PHILLIPS** of California. Mr. Speaker, supplementing what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. **O'KONSKI**] just said, I wish to call the attention of the House to the newspaper I have here. Under date of June 17, just a day or so ago, the Chicago Journal of Commerce reported three Russian ships loading in California harbors, with oil and gas for Vladivostok. Here is what the article says:

CALIFORNIA PORT LOADS RECORD OIL SHIPMENT TO RUSSIA

SAN PEDRO, CALIF., June 16.—Loading of what the Marine Exchange described as the largest shipment of petroleum supplies to Russia ever made from this port proceeded today.

The 50,000-barrel Soviet tanker *Elbrus* was loading with gasoline and oil. Two more 50,000-barrel tankers, the *Emba* and the *Krasnaia Armia*, arrived and were prepared to load. The 65,000-barrel *Taganrog* is due Thursday.

Two more Soviet ships, the *Maikop* and the *Belgorod*, have undergone repairs and are making ready to sail, and the exchange said eight other Soviet tankers were due in June.

Purchases were being handled through the Amtorg Trading Co. and consignments were to Vladivostok.

In the same paper there is an editorial entitled "Oil—Why a One-Way Iron Curtain?" It reads as follows:

OIL—WHY A ONE-WAY IRON CURTAIN?

(By Keith Fanshier)

A dispatch from an important west coast port tells of current record-breaking shipments from that point of petroleum products, consigned to the Soviet Russian port city of Vladivostok.

Considering the growing threat of petroleum shortage in the United States, large-scale exports of petroleum bound for destination in the Communist land itself have a strange aspect indeed.

So also the recent movement of pipe to Russia while the needs of American operators for that very pipe are contributing to the present supply stringency of the petroleum industry.

In Washington today high Government officials are taking time from their routine duties to study the short oil supply and its implications. Members of the industry too are deeply concerned with the same situation. Many key men have been appointed to groups named to study the threatening situation, as one phase of which the Government reports itself unable to obtain the petroleum needs of its military services.

Yet apparently not only materials and equipment needed by the petroleum industry, but also the very oil products themselves can move by the hundreds of thousands of barrels right through the iron curtain.

This would seem to be the very thing which the chairman of the National Petroleum Council recently protested as watering the roots of communism.

The White House professes itself to be outraged by recent developments on the continent of Europe which clearly are Communist-inspired and by which Red domination of nearby nations is intensified. This Government is supposed to be casting about for means to express its position.

Why would not a way to do this be to regard the iron curtain as a two-way rather than a one-way institution, and treat it as such?

Mr. **O'KONSKI**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **PHILLIPS** of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. **O'KONSKI**. It should be brought out that there are rumors it may be necessary to impose gasoline rationing in the United States of America in the next 30 days.

Mr. **PHILLIPS** of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. **MURRAY** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **PHILLIPS** of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. **MURRAY** of Wisconsin. Is it not true that the President has the power at the present time to control these exports?

Mr. **PHILLIPS** of California. Yes; that is my understanding. I think the gentleman's point is well taken.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO MESSAGE

Mr. **MACKINNON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MACKINNON**. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto message states that "labor-management cooperation is constantly improving."

Nothing is further from the truth according to the statistics published by the United States Department of Labor. They are as follows:

Year:	Man-days idle through work stoppage
1927.....	26,219,000
1928.....	12,632,000
1929.....	5,352,000
1930.....	3,317,000
1931.....	6,893,000
1932.....	10,502,000
1933.....	16,872,000
1934.....	19,592,000
1935.....	15,456,000
1936.....	13,902,000
1937.....	28,425,000
1938.....	9,148,000
1939.....	17,812,000
1940.....	6,701,000
1941.....	23,048,000
1942.....	4,183,000
1943.....	13,501,000
1944.....	8,721,000
1945.....	38,025,000
1946.....	116,000,000

Certainly an existence of more than three times as many strikes as ever before existed in the history of this country is not evidence of "labor-management cooperation." It is, however, interesting to note the President's use of the word "cooperation" because it was also cooperation that the President promised to

give this Congress. It is apparent from the President's actions with respect to the labor bill and the tax bill, and his use of the word "cooperation" in his veto message on the labor bill that his definition of cooperation does not fit that of any standard dictionary of the English language.

Mr. Speaker, I have read the veto message and I have heard it read, and I have one observation to make. The President has in every instance in which he construes the bill resorted to a specious construction of its provisions, and in no instance has he resorted to a reasonable construction of the language of H. R. 3020. In the President's veto message there are many misstatements of the contents of the bill and no one can read the President's message on this subject, his veto message of the Case bill last year, and conclude that he favors any legislation to cure any of the substantial evils which are presently existing in the labor-management field. His lack of any consistency in dealing with this problem is apparent particularly in his comments in paragraph 6 of his present veto message with respect to major strikes that effect the public health or safety. He objects to this provision and yet the President was the man who proposed drafting striking railroad workers into the Army. For the life of me I cannot understand a person who makes such a proposal and still objects to a reasonable proposal to allow mediation in such matters of great national concern. One can reach no other conclusion from his actions except that he is against any labor bill that is not exactly as he wishes it. If this is cooperation I cannot know the meaning of the word.

The veto message is a vicious attack against the labor bill. With respect to that feature of his message I point out that if the bill were as drastic as his veto message attempts to paint it, then why did it take him so long to make up his mind as to whether he should veto the bill or sign it.

Mr. Speaker, it was for the foregoing reasons that this House of Representatives was thoroughly justified in its action of overriding the President's veto by 331 to 83. I am informed that this is the most stunning rebuke that any President of the United States has ever received on a veto message in the entire history of our country. A clear majority of the Members of both parties voted to override. That was their answer to the pressure campaign in which labor organizations by their own admission spent millions of dollars. The House has this day by their action restored the faith of many in representative government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an Associated Press article from Durham, N. C., on the banning of two filthy screen films being shown by moving picture shows in that city.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by one of his constituents.

SHIPMENTS TO RUSSIA

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, we have just learned from the gentleman from Wisconsin regarding the shipment of oil to Russia. Some time this afternoon we will again discuss the so-called Voice of America. They will tell us that the Voice of America will be used to fight communism.

Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable that we should be shipping oil, locomotives, manufactured articles, and other equipment from this country to Russia, then spend \$31,000,000 to tell the people of the world that we are out to fight communism. Mr. Speaker, I just cannot quite comprehend this.

ACTION OF THE HOUSE IN OVERRIDING PRESIDENT'S VETO

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, with corporation profits the highest in the history of America, with inflationary prices and the cost of living the highest we have known in many, many years, with the housing and building program falling off due to unrestrained material prices, 16,000,000 organized workers in America and their families will look with fear today upon the action of this body. They can only await with prayers in their heart and hope that the action of the other body will be more favorable to their needs.

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is some delaying action going on at this time on the floor of the House against the Voice of America, to hamper the bringing up of this bill. Therefore I am going to get my 2 cents' worth in at this time by reading a letter I have just received from a manufacturer in my district who has returned recently from Germany:

I find the Communist Party active and distributing their literature and posters without regard for expense. The people of Germany and Europe in general are pitifully unacquainted with the other side of the story. Although I am heartily in favor of economy, I deplore the possible cancellation of funds for the Voice of America, and any other similar agencies that are tending to neutralize Communist propaganda.

I believe, in view of this, it is a mistake to filibuster any longer on this bill.

Let us get on with the business of the day.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

AUTOMOBILES FOR AMPUTEES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by General Rusk appearing in the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, General Rusk, who was a very famous flight surgeon during the war, a rehabilitation man, now the medical editor of the New York Times, wrote an article away back last December stating that in the last session the Congress passed a bill which gave automobiles to certain of the leg amputees. He now endorses very strongly the taking in of the amputees who were left out of that bill and certain paraplegic cases that were not included. He said it was discriminatory. I talked to General Rusk at the time the bill was introduced. He was not so enthusiastic about it then as a rehabilitation measure, but he told me last autumn it was a very fine piece of legislation for rehabilitation. It gives these men who are too disabled to get to and from work or to get to and from college and from on-the-job-training a chance to get there, a chance to learn and to become productive in business. It gives them a chance in the sun, and it will bring back money to the Government in taxes also. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that we should not economize when it comes to the disabled veterans. That is the last thing the people of the United States want. They insist that the disabled be cared for—and helped first of all—they demand action for disabled veterans.

The gentleman from New Jersey, Judge MATHEWS, made a masterly plea for his bill which includes veterans who were left out of the measure last year which was discriminatory. Last year's bill left out certain disabled veterans whose disabilities always have been classed together for rating purposes and for other benefits.

The article in the New York Times is as follows:

REHABILITATION ANOMALIES ARE NOTED IN THE LAW ON CARS FOR AMPUTEES—EARLY ADJUSTMENT IS HELD LIKELY AS THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS CONVENES

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

In ward 3D at the veterans' hospital in the Bronx, New York City, two severely disabled men occupy adjoining beds. Both are victims of spinal-cord injuries which have left them partially paralyzed. Both are classified as being totally disabled. Both draw maximum Government pensions. They differ, however, in degree of paralysis. The first is a paraplegic suffering from paralysis of both legs; the second is a quadriplegic with paralysis not only of the legs but of both arms and the trunk. Two weeks ago the paraplegic received a new specially equipped 1946 automobile from the Government. Ironically, the quadriplegic, even though his

disabilities are much more severe, is not entitled to receive a car.

The widely publicized "cars for amputees" bill which was passed by Congress last session denies a car to this second man because of his inability to pass an examination for a State driver's license. The act, Public Law 663, provides that veterans who have lost one or both legs, or the use of their legs, as a result of military service are entitled to a car at Government expense, but only if they hold a State driver's permit. This automatically excludes veterans paralyzed in the upper extremities.

ONE HUNDRED IN DIRE NEED FOR CARS

The number of men in military and veterans' hospitals who suffer paralysis of both upper and lower extremities is less than 100. Their need for cars, however, is even greater than the paraplegics and leg amputees who, with prosthesis and rehabilitation, can, in most cases, learn to walk. The man paralyzed in all extremities is unable to walk or use public conveyances. His chances for rehabilitation and recreation are contingent upon his traveling.

Amputees and paraplegics have many avenues open to them for employment, while men with paralyzed arms are unable to augment their Government pensions by earning money, except in rare cases. Thus, from a financial standpoint, they are in greater need. Without a car, they are completely home-bound. The fact that they themselves cannot drive should not mean they are to be imprisoned within the four walls of their homes. Members of their families and friends can drive for them. The important thing is that they are not permanently home-bound.

When the bill providing cars for amputees was pending in Congress last July, this column warned that the bill, as framed, would create inequalities, for its provisions were restrictive and did not establish need as the basis for its benefits.

BRADLEY CONCURS IN VIEW

This same vein was taken by General Bradley, Veterans' Administrator, and the major veterans' organizations. Those inequalities are shown by the paradoxical situation in which the most seriously disabled veterans are denied cars at Government expense while they are given to those with lesser disabilities.

Many veterans who suffered double arm amputations are bitter about the law, as they feel that they, too, have been discriminated against as their disabilities are more serious and incapacitating than the loss of one or both legs. These men are able to drive with the aid of special controls, and many hold State driver's permits. The law, however, restricts benefits to leg amputees and those who have lost the use of their legs.

Another anomaly of the law is evidenced by a letter received this past week from a paralyzed first lieutenant in the Army-Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs, Ark. This officer is not eligible for a car because he is still in the Army and the law applies only to veterans. Although he lost the use of his limbs in service, he will be hospitalized for such a long period before being discharged from the Army, he may not become a veteran before the law expires in June of next year. The obvious intent of Congress was to furnish this man with a car, but the technicalities of the law prevent it.

Although General Bradley vigorously opposed the law last summer in its present form, the VA took immediate steps to carry out its provisions. Within 30 days the first car, a hydramatic Oldsmobile sedan, was delivered to Richard A. Tenny of Washington, an ex-marine combat correspondent who lost his left leg at Iwo Jima.

ONLY 75 CARS DELIVERED

Up until October 1, out of 8,000 applications, only 75 cars had actually been delivered. The VA attributes this to the unavailability of cars from manufacturers. The Disabled American Veterans in the lead editorial of the last issue of their official organ point out that the maximum amount which can be paid for a car under the law is \$1,600 which includes all accessories, special driving controls, and taxes. The veteran is not permitted to purchase a more expensive car and personally pay the difference. The price of cars has risen since the law was passed. This, plus delivery costs to those living at great distances from the factory, often bring the price of the car above the established ceiling. The DAV suggests the technicalities of the law can be circumvented by eligible veterans purchasing cars without any accessories except the necessary driving controls and then purchasing additional accessories later from their own resources. If this does not bring the car within the limit of \$1,600, the other alternative is to go to the factory and drive the car home, thus eliminating delivery costs. The latter course, however, is often most impractical.

Sales taxes in many States help bring the car's cost above the price limit. The DAV calls attention to the fact that in Ohio cars purchased under the act are exempt from sales taxes and suggest this practice should be adopted in all States.

LAW WAS PASSED AS RIDER

Public Law 663 was passed by Congress in the closing days of last summer's session, and then only as a rider on the servicemen's terminal leave law which was "must" legislation. The critics of the bill at that time, including this writer, did not question the fairness of the principle of automobiles for certain disabled veterans at Government expense or the need of many disabled veterans for automobiles. They did, however, question the feasibility of the law as drawn, believing it sacrificed thoroughness and equality for the sake of expediency.

With the reorganization of the House of Representatives in the coming session, due to the Republican majority, it is assumed that Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, ranking Republican member of the House Veterans Committee, will replace Representative JOHN RANKIN as head of that committee. Mrs. ROGERS was one of the original sponsors of the "cars for amputees" bill and has long been a champion in the cause of the disabled veteran. Mrs. ROGERS will, if appointed to the post, probably work for immediate revision of the present law to remove the present unjust and illogical restrictions. It should be one of the first items of business on the crowded agenda of her committee.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] charged—at least he intimated—that a filibuster was going on here. Well, be that as it may, I want to congratulate the gentleman on contributing his 1 minute to the filibuster.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 29, noes 84.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 86]

Andrews, N. Y.	Gallagher	McMillan, S. C.
Banta	Gifford	Mansfield, Tex.
Bell	Granger	O'Toole
Bennett, Mich.	Gross	Patman
Bland	Hall	Plumley
Bonner	Leonard W.	Poulson
Boykin	Hart	Powell
Brophy	Hartley	Ramey
Burke	Heffernan	Rayfel
Byrne, N. Y.	Jenkins, Pa.	Rich
Celler	Jennings	Sabath
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Seely-Brown
Combs	Jones, Wash.	Shafer
Coudert	Kefauver	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Kelley	Smith, Ohio
Dawson, Ill.	Kennedy	Taylor
Delaney	Keogh	Thomas, N. J.
Dingell	Kerr	Van Zandt
Dolliver	Larcade	West
Fellows	Lea	Winstead
Fogarty	Lusk	Youngblood
Fuller	Lynch	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 365 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INFORMATIONAL SERVICE, STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma) there were—ayes 102, noes 11.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 303, noes 63, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

YEAS—303

Abernethy	Andersen	Bakewell
Albert	H. Carl	Barden
Allen, Calif.	Anderson, Calif.	Barrett
Allen, Ill.	Andrews, Ala.	Bates, Ky.
Allen, La.	Arends	Battle
Almond	Arnold	Beall

Beckworth
Bell
Blackney
Blatnik
Bloom
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Boiton
Bradley
Bramblett
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Buck
Buckley
Burleson
Busbey
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carroll
Carson
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chadwick
Chapman
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Clark
Clason
Clements
Coffin
Cole, Kans.
Colmer
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Cotton
Courtney
Cox
Cravens
Crawford
Cresser
Crow
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Dingell
Dirksen
Domengaux
Donohue
Dorn
Doughton
Douglas
Drewry
Durham
Eaton
Eberharter
Elliott
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fisher
Flannagan
Fletcher
Fogarty
Folger
Foote
Forand
Fulton
Gamble
Gary
Gathings
Goff
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Gossett
Grant, Ala.
Grant, Ind.
Gregory
Gwinn, N. Y.

Gwynne, Iowa
Hagen
Hale
Hall
Edwin Arthur
Hall
Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Hardy
Harless, Ariz.
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Hartley
Havener
Hays
Hedrick
Heffernan
Hendricks
Herter
Heseltun
Hill
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoeven
Holmes
Hope
Howell
Huber
Jackson, Calif.
Jackson, Wash.
Jarman
Javits
Jenkins, Ohio
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Tex.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Jones, Ohio
Jonkman
Judd
Karsten, Mo.
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Keefe
Kersten, Wis.
Kilburn
Kilday
King
Klein
Kunkel
Lane
Lanham
Larcade
Latham
Lea
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lewis
Lodge
Love
Lucas
Lyle
McConnell
McDonough
McDowell
McMahon
McMillen, Ill.
MacKinnon
Macy
Madden
Mahon
Manasco
Mansfield,
Mont.
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
Meade, Ky.
Meade, Md.
Merrill
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Mitchell
Monroney
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton

Mundt
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
Nixon
Nodar
Norblad
Norrell
Norton
O'Brien
O'Konski
Pace
Passman
Patterson
Peden
Peterson
Pfeifer
Philbin
Phillips, Calif.
Pickett
Plumley
Poage
Potts
Poulson
Preston
Price, Fla.
Price, Ill.
Priest
Rabin
Rains
Ramey
Rayburn
Redden
Reed, Ill.
Rees
Reeves
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Robertson
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Rooney
Ross
Russell
Sabath
Sadlak
Sadowski
Sarbacher
Sasser
Scoblick
Scott, Hardie
Scrivner
Shafer
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Maine
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Somers
Spence
Stanley
Stefan
Stevenson
Stockman
Stratton
Sundstrom
Talle
Teague
Thomas, N. J.
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Tollerson
Towe
Trimble
Twyman
Vail
Wadsworth
Walter
Weichel
Welch
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Williams
Wilson, Tex.
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood
Worley
Zimmerman

NAYS—63

Banta
Bender
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Brehm
Brophy
Brown, Ohio
Buffett
Butler
Church
Clevenger
Clippinger
Cole, Mo.
D'Ewart
Dondero
Ellis
Gallagher
Gavin
Gearhart
Gillette
Gillie

Graham
Griffiths
Gross
Harness, Ind.
Hess
Hoffman
Hull
Jenison
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.
Landis
Lemke
McCowan

NOT VOTING—63

Andresen,
August H.
Andrews, N. Y.
Angell
Auchincloss
Bates, Mass.
Bennett, Mich.
Bland
Bonner
Boykin
Buiwinkle
Burke
Byrne, N. Y.
Celler
Cole, N. Y.
Combs
Coudert
Davis, Tenn.
Deaney
Devitt
Dolliver
Fellows
Fuller
Gifford
Goodwin
Granger
Hébert
Hollifield
Horan
Jenkins, Pa.
Jones, Wash.
Kefauver
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kirwan
Knutson
Lesinski
Lusk
Lynch
McCormack
McGarvey
McMillan, S. C.

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. McGarvey with Mr. McMillan of South Carolina.
Mr. Seely-Brown with Mr. Lynch.
Mr. Rich with Mrs. Lusk.
Mr. Horan with Mr. Hollifield.
Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Auchincloss with Mr. Rayfield.
Mr. Angell with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Combs.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Rockwell with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Devitt with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Vorys with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Weichel with Mr. O'Toole.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Granger.
Mr. Knutson with Mr. Byrne of New York.
Mr. Jones of Washington with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Youngblood with Mr. Kelley.
Mr. Burke with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Bates of Massachusetts with Mr. Kerr.
Mr. Goodwin with Mr. Boykin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3342, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 13, line 3, after the word "States", insert a period and strike out the words "and in other countries."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, on the floor and in the lobby there has been not a little comment during the three preceding days that this bill has been under discussion all to the effect that

some folks were filibustering, delaying proceedings.

Permit me most respectfully to call attention to the fact that on practically every vote that has been taken, rising vote or teller vote, that only once during all that voting has more than one-third of the Republicans of this House voted in favor of keeping this bill alive, or in opposition to the amendments which have been offered. That one occasion was when 53 Republicans voted to keep the bill alive and 78 voted to strike the enacting clause. The 53 won because they were joined by a solid Democratic vote. So, if there is delay, that delay is not caused by those who are opposing this legislation. It is due to the fact that a minority group of the majority party has insisted for 4 days in having its way. This bill has been kept alive and this bill is today before the House and before the Committee because the minority of the Republicans supported by the minority party as a unit want it to be here and want it passed, so there is no question of a lack of party regularity on the part of those of us who oppose this legislation.

Now, this amendment has this effect. On page 12 there is a provision in subsection (1) authorizing the Secretary of State "to make grants of money, services, or materials to State and local governmental institutions in the United States, to governmental institutions in other countries, and to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations both in the United States." And then these words which I ask be stricken "and in other countries."

All this amendment seeks to do is to strike from that subparagraph the authority of the Secretary of State to make grants of money, services or materials to individuals and to public or private nonprofit organization in other countries. We had UNRRA and we had this and that organization legalized by Congress peddling our money all over the world. In general, the funds were wasted and misapplied. Whether it was legalized or not, we now know that some one, Treasury, State, or War Department, authorized the Russians and the Italians to print invasion money, which apparently we now must redeem, to the amount of some \$400,000,000.

The argument now made is this, that it is about time that the United States of America quit authorizing anyone, Secretary of State or anyone else, to give away the money which we raise through taxation. It is time now that we end that. A former President of the United States suggested the other day, as he has at various times in the past, and as Members of this House for the last 3 or 4 years repeatedly asked, that we take an inventory and learn what, if anything, we have left; how much we can afford to give away. The Members in the other body, the great international statesmen just recently fell in with that idea and said that it might be a good thing before we gave away or pledged ourselves further to ascertain whether we had anything to give away. It is self-evident that we do not have the money; that every dollar that is going to be appropriated under this legislation will have to be

borrowed, and so why should we now authorize the Secretary of State to give away as much as \$34,000,000 that this bill will ultimately call for to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations in other countries. Let him do it? I cannot understand it, and I hope that someone will enlighten me and relieve my ignorance, and that the committee will adopt this amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the first part of his remarks the gentleman from Michigan indicated that he was speaking for the majority of the members of the Republican Party and that most of the members of the Republican Party had voted as he had on the various measures and amendments up to now. I do not know whether the Republican Members of the House are following the foreign policy proposals of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], whether they are following the recommendations of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, or whether they are following the impulses of their own convictions. Each of you has to decide that for yourself on the measures which come before us.

I think, however, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has drawn the issue pretty clearly. I think he has dramatized the division which exists among Republicans and Democrats alike on matters of this kind. I want it understood, at least for myself, that I do not propose to follow any foreign policy pattern which isolates America from the peace.

I think there are some things about so-called isolationism which might be justified at times, when you attempt to isolate a country from war, but when you attempt to isolate a country from peace, when you attempt to break down the peace machinery of America, when you tell the State Department, "We will deny you the tools that you tell us you need to build the temple of peace," I want no mistake in the record about where I stand. I do not stand for that kind of isolationism, and I do not believe the Republican Party does either.

May I point out about the particular amendment in question that it is just one little isolationistic clause which would say that you cannot aid American institutions such as the great American university at Beirut in Syria, which our former Minister to Syria, Mr. George Wadsworth, tells us has done more to help maintain friendly relations with the Arab people and maintain American prestige in the Middle East than any other one thing. It would say you cannot aid Roberts College at Istanbul, Turkey, a country in which we are spending \$250,000,000 of the American taxpayers' dollars. This amendment would say you cannot go in there and help the people of Turkey understand America by aiding Turkish students to learn the truth about us in this great American college.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an unwise amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does that bar debate on other amendments which are on the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. On this section only.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 13, at the end of line 4, insert the following: "Provided, however, That no grant of money, services, or materials shall be made under this subsection to any governmental institution or to individuals or public or private organizations in any country which has a socialistic or communistic form of government or which is under the domination of any government having a communistic government or which advocates or teaches communism."

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 702. In carrying on activities which further the purposes of this act, subject to the approval of such activities by the Secretary, the Department and the other Government agencies are authorized—

(1) to place orders and make purchases and rentals of materials and equipment;

(2) to make contracts, including contracts with governmental agencies, foreign or domestic, including subdivisions thereof, and intergovernmental organizations of which the United States is a member, and, with respect to contracts entered into in foreign countries, without regard to section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22);

(3) under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to pay the transportation expenses, and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, of citizens or subjects of other countries, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Act of 1926, as amended;

(4) under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Act of 1926, as amended, to provide for planned travel itineraries within the United States by groups of citizens or subjects of other countries, to pay the expenses of such travel, and to detail, as escorts of such groups, officers and employees of the Government, whose expenses may be paid out of funds advanced or transferred by the Secretary for the general expenses of the itineraries;

(5) to make grants for, and to pay expenses incident to, training and study;

(6) to provide for, and pay the expenses of, attendance at meetings or conventions of societies and associations concerned with furthering the purposes of this act when provided for by the appropriation act; and

(7) to provide for, and pay the expenses of, the purchase of health and accident insurance for persons not employed by the United States Government while away from home under the authority of this act, or for Philippine trainees who receive training from a Government agency in the United States under authority of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended (Public Laws 370 and 597, 79th Cong.), and to defray the expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of such persons who may die.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 16, line 2, after the semicolon insert the word "and."

On page 16, line 6, strike out all after the word "appropriation", and all of lines 7 to 18, inclusive, and insert the word "act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago when this bill was under consideration I was shocked and humiliated and aggrieved to hear the genial gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], whom we affectionately call Toby, unbosom himself of these words:

Why, you ask most any school child in America where the largest trees are and he will say, as I heard it alleged on the floor of the House, that they are out in California. But the biggest trees in the world are not in California. We think so. Why? Because it is so easy for us all to become big headed, to think that everything we have is the biggest and best in the world.

When I recovered from the impact of those words I went scurrying to the Encyclopedia Britannica and found in volume 20, page 339, these comforting words:

The redwood tree, the *Sequoia sempervirens*, is the tallest of trees. Many specimens attain a height of over 300 feet, and one now standing near Dyerville, Humboldt County, is by careful measurement 364 feet. Maximum diameter of the redwood is about 18 feet, considerably less than the big tree, although exceeded by very few others. Mature trees vary in age from about 400 years to about 2,000.

The big tree, the *Sequoia gigantea*, is the largest of all trees in bulk and commonly reputed to be the oldest living thing. Largest specimen is "General Sherman" in Sequoia National Park measuring 101½ feet in circumference at base, mean base diameter 32 feet, diameter 8 feet above ground 27 feet, diameter 100 feet above ground 18½ feet. Height above mean base 272 feet, diameter of largest branch (130 feet above ground) 6½ feet, total weight estimated at 2,150 tons of which the foliage alone constitutes 155 tons (Frye and White, 1938). A few specimens stand over 300 feet high but are less in total bulk than "General Sherman." Age, based on ring counts, is known to exceed 3,000 years in some instances.

So, Mr. Chairman, whether the school children of America are big-headed or not, according to how the genial gentleman from Oklahoma meant it, they are quite right in believing that the tallest of trees and the largest in bulk are still growing in California.

So we must in this instance credit to California the honor of offering the hospitality of its soil to the oldest, the tallest and the largest living things on the face of the earth, its *Sequoia gigantea* and *Sequoia sempervirens*, monarchs of the forests, giants of antiquity that they are.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. The largest trees in the world, according to authentic information that I have, are in the Belgian Congo. I just wonder if this article

might not have been written by Paul Bunyan.

Mr. GEARHART. So far as I know Paul Bunyan is not a contributor to the Encyclopedia Britannica. The gentleman will recall that it was on the 6th day of June that his objected-to remarks were uttered, so the gentleman from California has had ample opportunity to make a very, very careful check of the authorities, not only of the Encyclopedia Britannica, but with the Forestry Service and the Architect of the Capitol, and they agree and report to him that without question the tallest and biggest trees, the oldest living things on the face of the earth, still grow in California. I merely rise to make announcement of the immutable facts of the forest. With the modesty of a true Californian, I submit them to my good friend, the gentleman of the great State of Oklahoma. The proofs are before you.

Mr. MORRIS. I think I can prove to the contrary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, some time ago when I read this letter before the House, we were in such a furor that I doubt very much that many Members got the contents of it, and I am going to read it again. I think after I read it you may wake up to the fact that we do need this bill.

This is a letter written to me, incidentally, by the president of a small manufacturing company in my district who had recently visited the continent of Europe and had gone particularly into Germany.

He writes:

I find the Communist Party active and distributing their literature and posters without regard for expense. The people of Germany and Europe in general are pitifully unacquainted with the other side of the story. Although I am heartily in favor of economy, I deplore the possible cancellation of funds for the Voice of America, and any other similar agencies that are tending to neutralize Communist propaganda. The funds required for this purpose are moderate compared with what is being spent in larger quantities for less essential purposes.

That was signed by a reputable manufacturer in my district, who knows what he is talking about, and certainly cannot be inferred to be a Communist.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am sorry; my time is limited.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What does the gentleman manufacture? Radios?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Well, now, since you are on that subject of radios, I am going to take a minute and say that apparently some of the opposition to this measure may be coming from a lack of conviction on the part of some of the membership of this House as to the effectiveness of the radio in telling the truth. I am not talking about propaganda. I am not talking about advertising. I am talking about the ability of the radio to disseminate the truth. I

think it is high time that the people of Europe are given the truth. The Voice of America has been accused of being subversive; that is, the activities of the "Voice of America" have been called subversive, and some of the individuals connected with the program are accused of being subversive.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot yield. My time is limited.

The truth is that what this House should do at this time in considering this bill is to write into this legislation enough assurance against the activities of any subversive people so as to guarantee the Voice of America to be the voice of America; and I see no reason why we cannot do it. That is one reason I am for this bill.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Why do not we appropriate money to secure radios to distribute over in those countries so they can listen to the program when it does go through?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. This is a step in the right direction. You can bring radios in too.

Mr. GAVIN. They have not got any radios.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is something we can consider a little later. I do feel, however, that it is timely to give consideration to this because we cannot afford according to the letter of this gentleman to go very much further allowing these lies, innuendoes, and adverse propaganda to be going into the various countries of Europe where we have attempted to do everything we could for them.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. I wonder if the gentleman thinks it possible that some of the Members do not believe radio is here to stay?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman thinks as I do, that probably there is a feeling on the part of some of the Members that radio is not effective; but let me give you an example. Many Members of the House have had to counteract adverse and vicious propaganda back home while they were down here on the job, while they were attending to their official duties and pursuing the job which the people elected them to fulfill. Many Members have been actually defeated back home because they were unable to get back home to defend themselves against these vicious lies and innuendoes that subversive individuals back home have spread about them.

The point is that the radio in many cases has enabled them to carry the truth of their convictions back home and to tell the people correctly of their position. I say the same thing can be done with the United States.

Let us tell the other countries the truth by developing the Voice of America, so that it is loud enough and strong enough to be heard all over the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot arrive at a limitation of debate. I see seven Members on their feet.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, while the House has been discussing that example of sheer madness, the Voice of America, our State Department has been engaged in a wholesale propaganda campaign here at home to sell this piece of sheer madness to the American people. Commentators, newspapers, all kinds of opinion-forming groups in American life have been peddled this idea of wasting \$30,000,000 on hot air.

At the same time that this piece of sheer madness has been peddled around the country we find that the State Department has delivered itself of approximately a dozen major foreign-policy speeches which conservatively estimated that we will spend anywhere from six to eight billion dollars a year for the next 4 or 5 years to reconstruct the economy of Europe.

Numerous suggestions have been made that Mr. Truman will call the Congress back into session in September and lay before us a six or eight billion dollar program to execute the Truman and Marshall doctrines in Europe.

Perhaps the House should begin to examine the way in which the State Department spends money on publicity and propaganda within the United States. In my opinion the State Department is engaged in a wholesale propaganda campaign right here in America using the taxpayers' money to pressure the Congress into voting not thirty million but \$30,000,000,000 for the reconstruction of Europe.

Somehow or other the State Department does not seem to think that the American taxpayer wants to spend this money else why would the State Department be engaged in this propaganda campaign here at home?

The whole publicity and propaganda set-up of the State Department should be investigated. The Voice of America should, of course, be eliminated, and best of all, of course, would be the removal from office of the present administration in 1948. This insane policy of pouring out billions of dollars on objectives which are unlimited and the principal consideration of which is to rearm the world for another world war, this policy will only be defeated by the removal from office of the group of State Department bureaucrats to whom nothing is sacred except their own prestige and personal bureaucratic power.

Sheer madness is the only way that John Q. Citizen can describe the proposals which have been put before us. Sheer madness is the basis of our present

foreign policy. To launch this Nation upon a world-wide system of entangling military alliances and unilateral economic grants will end only in the bankruptcy of our Nation. This House should say a firm and decisive "No" to the proposal for a phony Voice of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which has been at the desk for a long time and I have been sitting here to get a few minutes to discuss it. Now I finally wind up with 4 minutes on this important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: Page 15, strike out all of subparagraphs 3 and 4 and on page 16, strike out subparagraph 6.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman be willing to divide his amendment into two parts, one having to do with subparagraph 3 and the other having to do with 4 and 6. The committee is willing to accept 4 and 6, but 3 has been in the law and regulations since the beginning of the program, and we feel we must oppose that. Is the gentleman willing to divide his amendment?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to divide the amendment in view of the statement just made by the distinguished gentleman, a member of the committee. Do I understand that the committee is willing to accept the amendment as divided so as to strike out paragraphs 4 and 6 and allow another amendment to be submitted separately to strike out paragraph 3? If so, I will be glad to do that, and I ask unanimous consent to so modify the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman's amendment will be modified accordingly.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Will that require then the submission of a new amendment in order to accomplish the purpose of striking out subparagraph 3?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that will require a new amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. I shall try to do so as soon as I can get time to write it out.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I would like to inquire if the committee will not accept the amendment as amended. I understand they will accept it, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE as modified: On page 15, strike out all of subparagraph 4; and on page 16, strike out all of subparagraph 6.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, we will accept the amendment in that form.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would now like to offer an amendment to strike out the provisions of subparagraph 3.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 15, strike out all of subparagraph 3.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I had an amendment on the desk to strike that paragraph.

Mr. KEEFE. I will withdraw the amendment then, Mr. Chairman, and ask unanimous consent so to do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; if it is the same one, the gentleman can offer it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike subparagraph 3, that is all right with me.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. May I inquire of the Chair just what the status is at the present time? I did offer an amendment to strike subparagraph 3.

The CHAIRMAN. That amendment is now pending.

Mr. KEEFE. Am I recognized then for that purpose?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized within the 4 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment. I do not have any time. I only have about 30 seconds under that situation. I will not have any time to discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 15, strike out all of subsection 3.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hoped the gentleman from Wisconsin would offer this amendment because I thought the committee might accept it in order to avoid opposition. Though I suspect that in the end we will find the original provisions back in the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will make a correction right now myself. I want to state that the gentleman from South Dakota inadvertently—get that word—misstated my position a while ago when he stated that I was speaking for the Republican Party. I never, never in my life tried to speak for anyone except the Representative from the Fourth Michigan District. Now get that thoroughly

in mind. The only thing I was calling attention to when I said this was not a Republican measure was when the motion was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], to strike the enacting clause, 78 Republicans went down the aisle past the tellers to do that very thing, and 53, and only 53, were in favor of keeping this bill alive. That was the point I was trying to make. Seventy-eight voted to kill the bill. It is alive and here on the floor because a minority of the Republicans aided by an almost solid Democratic bloc keeps life in it.

As to this amendment, the amendment is that we strike out subparagraph 3. My amendment was that we change the \$10 to \$5. I just thought that \$5 a day was enough. I can see no reason why we should pay these men more than we pay the returned veterans who are in this country or elsewhere. I cannot understand it. Rear Admiral Zacharias, who testified before a House committee yesterday and today, was asked about this Voice of America program. He said, as many of us believe, that if you keep the machinery and get rid of those who are operating and feeding it, there would be some good accomplished.

Every Member of this House who is advised of the situation knows that in the State Department there have been over the years not one but many Communists, and we have every reason to believe that some of them are there yet. Now, why should we let the State Department peddle this Voice of America through people who believe as these people do believe? People who do not believe in America. If the committee wants to keep the machinery alive, all well and good, but then get some competent engineers, some competent people to write and speak the output, so that really and truly it will be the Voice of America which today it is not. They should not only quit sending across those pictures of the fat woman, a disgrace to all of us, but they should quit sending out the false information and the doctrine in which no American believes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JUDD. Are these amendments to be voted on as they are offered or at the end of the allotted time?

The CHAIRMAN. As they are offered.

Mr. JUDD. Then I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman claim the time of the committee?

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment because I think the gentleman who offered it believes the authorization in subparagraph 3 is something new or makes more liberal grants than heretofore. As a matter of fact, it has been in the appropriation acts and the regulations issued under them for several years. You can find on page A2982 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the portion of the 1947 State Department Appropriation Act, which specifically authorizes for this year such a grant for travel expenses in lieu of subsistence. I have here the Federal Register for August 23, 1944, con-

taining the travel regulations which Cordell Hull established then and under which the program still operates.

It divides those who come here or go abroad into two groups. One is the leaders, who are defined as "professors and instructors, persons of influence, and persons of outstanding accomplishment or possessing special qualifications in a professional, technical, cultural, or specialized field." The other group is the students, internes, trainees.

Under "Grants to foreign leaders" the regulations state:

Per diem of \$10 in lieu of subsistence and all incidental expenses including gratuitous fees, taxi fares, head tax, visa fees, telegraph and telephone charges, etc., while traveling to and from the United States except for the period spent on seagoing vessels.

When it is reduced to \$5 as a later paragraph stipulates:

Provided, That when a traveler is furnished meals and/or lodging without charge by a United States department or agency, one-fifth of the authorized per diem shall be deducted for each meal or night's lodging.

Under "Grants to foreign students," it is provided that students traveling by land or by air get \$7 a day in lieu of subsistence and when by sea \$3.50 a day.

Later in the regulations is a section headed, "Maxima not controlling" under which it is made clear that the \$10 figure is the maximum that can be paid. Smaller per diem where indicated can be specified in the contract or the grant to a student or a professor at the time his appointment is made.

It seems to me the committee would not consider it proper to bring here a distinguished scientist or a professor or the president of a university, some great scholar or inventor or cultural or religious leader, from this or that country, and pay for his ticket, but not make suitable provision for him to get a place to sleep or food to eat en route. The per diem applies only when he is traveling. The average total cost for a foreign student living in this country is \$1,800 a year. The average total amount furnished by the State Department is less than \$700 a year per student, less than half the average amount paid to a GI student per year.

We have always provided this travel per diem heretofore. It has not been abused. I do not believe we ought to strike it out now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, the further this debate goes the more confused I become. My good friend from California talked on trees, California's great trees. I think it would be more profitable for me if I took the short time allotted to me to discuss Pennsylvania grade crude oil, one of the finest lubricating oils in the world. An oil that is known the world over and ever since oil was discovered in my State—the great State of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania grade crude oil is recognized as the outstanding lubricant of the Nation.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. Do I understand from the gentleman's remarks that he would like to have this bill in the grease?

Mr. GAVIN. Not exactly that, but I might say to the gentleman from California who gave such a splendid talk on California trees that in the future he use Pennsylvania grade crude oil in his car when traveling through the California forests.

Mr. GEARHART. That I will.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the voice of Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. GAVIN. My time is limited; however, I cannot help but yield to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, one of the outstanding Members of the Pennsylvania delegation, a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, a man who commands the respect and admiration of the Congress for his fine work, and I might add, a man who has won for himself the hearty commendations of the membership on both sides of the aisle. I am glad to yield to my good friend and colleague.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the gentleman. I wish the gentleman would make that speech in my district some time. Will the gentleman please call attention to the fact that the only standing tract of virgin timber left in the United States east of the Mississippi River is in our own State of Pennsylvania in Cook Forest?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, and it is a gorgeous tract of timber, 8,700 acres of virgin pine that we have preserved to show future generations of Americans the beauties of the Pennsylvania woods.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to get back to this bill. I might say I have a great respect and admiration for all the members of the committee.

The bill as it now stands is a hodgepodge of confusing, conflicting pronouncements so muddled up by amendments that no one can tell exactly what it contains.

It is evident that the committee has been quite willing to accept any and all amendments offered, in the hope, I presume, of getting votes, merely to pass a bill, any kind of a bill.

This proposed legislation has been poorly presented; the evidence submitted is but little more than vague promises of what will or will not be done. The committee has not presented a case based on facts that we, as representatives of 140,000,000 people, can intelligently cast our vote for to create a vehicle to sell America to the world at a terrific cost to the American taxpayer, when in reality we have oversold ourselves already.

I have no confidence in this branch of the State Department which has been handling this matter. I have no faith in the integrity or ability of these individuals to do the kind of a job that should be done.

They say that Secretary of State Marshall will clean house. Well, he should have cleaned house before he came to Congress for a blank check to permit this blundering outfit to continue. We have heard repeatedly about cleaning house;

but once the legislation is on the books the old gang takes over and carries on in any way they see fit.

How is Secretary Marshall going to look after this outfit? He will have plenty to do looking after Uncle Sam's affairs for the next 2 or 3 years without looking after the Voice.

I am tired of listening to a lot of glittering generalities. I want sound facts.

Let me ask you this; if you were the president of a corporation accountable to your stockholders and you listened as we have for 3 days to testimony and you were asked to approve the spending of ten, twenty, or thirty million dollars of your company's money for such a program as has been proposed, what would you do? Why, you would not give them a thin dime.

Well, you are directors in a great corporation, elected to look after the taxpayers' dollars and if you can reconcile yourself to approving this program to carry on with an element who have been tossing the American taxpayers' money down a rat hole, I cannot. This bill should be recommitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of the committee will not be confused about who will come to the United States to study, should this bill be passed. There have been a great many amendments adopted. In fact, the amendment that I was going to offer was offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the committee accepted it. I think it helps the bill, but even with these amendments there are many things in this bill that are not satisfactory.

I would call your attention to the fact that the State Department reported to me the first of the week that there were 16,956 students from many foreign countries now studying in the United States. Of this number, 60 are from Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, which is now behind the iron curtain. The number of students, mostly GI's, from the United States studying in foreign countries is 3,163. They are studying in a great many universities.

I also call your attention to the fact that without this bill these students are here. Without this bill they are going to continue to be here. Every university in the country has exchange scholarships with universities in other countries, which will continue to go on.

It must be quite evident to the members of the committee that the State Department, in bringing this bill through the committee, is trying to build up a large bureau or agency in the State Department, and making it a permanent bureau. The bill goes far beyond the original intent of the will of Congress and does not reflect the publicity which goes out on this legislation.

When Secretary Marshall was before the Senate committee he said we must have some means of broadcasting to other countries. With that I agree. I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] when he said we should sell America to the rest of the world. I want to do that, but I

contend, and I feel sure you will agree, that this bill goes far beyond that purpose.

I hope at the proper time, unless it is offered by someone on the minority side, to offer a motion to recommit, to make this bill just a broadcasting bill.

The other body has reported out a bill that is just a broadcasting bill and I think we ought to conform to that language and the original intent of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MATHEWS: Add a new subsection to section 702, as follows: "Due to the crowded conditions in the institutions of learning of this country, which are interfering with the opportunities of veterans and others to obtain their educations, and to presently prevent the diversion of further Federal funds from use for the education of our own veterans, as now provided by law, subsections (3) and (5) of this section shall not become effective until 1 year after the effective date of the remaining provisions of this act."

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is perfectly clear. It is to defer the effectiveness of subsections (3) and (5) of this particular section for 1 year, for the reasons stated in the amendment itself.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] having failed, the per diem allowance still remains at \$10 per day, or \$300 a month, which is five times the rate paid to our own veterans in the institutions of learning, which are now overcrowded. This bill, of course, will overcrowd them more by bringing in foreign students and foreign teachers.

During the colloquy with the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, the other day, as brought out here today, there is already authorization apparently for the State Department to conduct this Latin-American program. It will not affect that at all. In fact, I would like to see them concentrate on Latin America for the next year, under previous authority granted. Not only that, but the colleges themselves can exchange students and can exchange professors without the necessity of this act. There will be nothing whatsoever to interfere with the purposes of this act, except that during this period when we are told that we cannot grant even certain necessary funds for disabled veterans during this year because of economy, we should spend \$10 a day or \$300 a month to bring foreign students here, to crowd our own students out of the universities.

I spoke on this matter the other day. I think this is a very reasonable amendment and ought to be accepted, because I do not think this Government should be spending that money at a time when we are only spending a little bit for our own veterans to get their education, when the other objectives can be accomplished. At the end of the year we will know better where we stand and what world conditions are.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHEWS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. And the program for the exchange of teachers and students will go on whether this bill is passed or not?

Mr. MATHEWS. That is exactly right. Mr. DONDERO. Through our own colleges and universities?

Mr. MATHEWS. Yes, sir. And our program with Latin America will still go on under Government expense.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHEWS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Nobody comes in under this program except graduate students, who go to graduate schools, usually on a fellowship, or doing special work with a particular professor or research man.

They do not interfere with the GI's, most of whom, of course, are undergraduates. Even if you consider all of the foreign students under this program as undergraduates, they would constitute only one-twentieth of 1 percent of the total number in our colleges. If this program were to displace any GI's I would go along with the gentleman in opposition; but knowing what kind of students are coming under this legislation I do not see how they would interfere with or prevent the education of GI's.

Mr. MATHEWS. How can the gentleman know what students are coming? He does not have charge of the students.

Mr. JUDD. Because the committee has gone over the lists from the countries that come under the program. Most of the foreign students in this country do not come under the State Department. Only a handful come under this program.

Mr. MATHEWS. Does the committee hand-pick and check the students?

Mr. JUDD. No. They are selected by committees of scholars and Americans abroad and are placed and supervised in this country by the Institute of International Education—a private association of educators. I will have something to say about that later.

Mr. MATHEWS. I do not understand the gentleman's statements. How does he reconcile them?

Mr. JUDD. If I said the committee went over the individual students on the lists, I misspoke myself. What I meant to say was that we have gone over the list showing the number and kind of students—that is, scientific, agricultural, medical, and so forth—from each of the countries from which they are received; and I said further that most of the students are coming primarily for special graduate training, students who have passed competitive examinations and been selected for their special ability. Most of the foreign students in this country came on their own, have scholarships, or are able to support themselves from their own resources, but some of the ablest are not. This program is designed especially for that class.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-two Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 88]

Andresen,	Fogarty	Pace
August H.	Fuller	Patman
Auchincloss	Gallagher	Phillips, Calif.
Bennett, Mich.	Gifford	Powell
Bland	Goff	Rayfel
Boggs, La.	Gossett	Rich
Bonner	Granger	Robison
Brophy	Hagen	St. George
Buckley	Hartley	Scott,
Buffett	Hébert	Hugh D., Jr.
Bulwinkle	Hedrick	Seely-Brown
Burleson	Heffernan	Sheppard
Carroll	Hill	Simpson, Ill.
Celler	Hope	Smith, Ohio
Chapman	Jenkins, Pa.	Stratton
Clark	Jones, Wash.	Thomas, N. J.
Cole, N. Y.	Kefauver	Thomas, Tex.
Combs	Kelley	Thomason
Coudert	Keogh	Van Zandt
Davis, Tenn.	Kerr	Vinson
Deane	Kirwan	Vorys
Delaney	Klein	West
Dingell	Knutson	Wilson, Tex.
Dolliver	Lesinski	Winstead
Domenegeaux	Lusk	Wood
Drewry	Lynch	Worley
Elliott	McGarvey	Youngblood
Feighan	McMillan, S. C.	Zimmerman
Fellows	Mansfield, Tex.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having under consideration the bill H. R. 3342, and finding itself without a quorum, he directed the roll to be called, when 343 Members responded to their names, disclosing that a quorum was present; and he handed in the names of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

There being no objection, the Clerk again read the amendment offered by Mr. MATHEWS.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MATHEWS) there were—ayes 40, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, the remarks I am about to make were intended to apply to subparagraph 4, but since that paragraph has been eliminated, I conclude they are quite germane to subparagraph 3.

The real purpose of my comments is to support the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] in setting forth the merits of the State of California, as one of the chief stops in this series of travels which I understand is being contemplated for the various scientists of foreign lands.

I would invite your attention to this full page of beautiful pictures. Just see those magnificent beaches at Long Beach, Calif.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENNINGS. The Committee, in the shadow of the great trees of California, is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will be in order.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, these beaches are as broad as the purposes of this bill. As you look along them you can no more see their end than you can see the end of the ramifications of this legislation. And now look at this lower picture. You see a crowded beach. With our usual Californian modesty, we note that we expect only a million people there on the next Fourth of July; but, Mr. Chairman, we can squeeze that million up a little and work in a few thousand of the best of these professors and students, especially so if the Government pays their expenses.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy that on this occasion I have been able to get ahead of Florida, and I hope that the chambers of commerce of the Golden State will take due notice of this most worthy accomplishment.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from the great State of California yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. Gladly to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. My heart palpitated with happiness and gratitude when I heard the gentleman speak so eloquently of our beaches, the glory of our great State. Tomorrow I shall introduce a resolution to move those beaches up to my trees in Kings Canyon National Park, so that it may become possible for the thousands upon thousands of our visitors to sit in the shade as they gaze out over the mighty Pacific, contemplating its wonders, marveling at its greatness.

Mr. BRADLEY. May I remind the gentleman from California that my beaches are older than his trees. They are larger than his trees. I think if either were to be moved, his trees should be brought to our southern California beaches. There, they would prove to be a great added attraction—not that any such is really needed, but, nevertheless, additional attractions are always welcome.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman's comment is well made. I bow my head in recognition of the great age and the incomparable wonders of the great beaches of southern California. On second thought I think I will leave my trees where they are. What do you say, you keep your beaches and I will keep my trees.

Mr. BRADLEY. It is a deal. I thank the gentleman from the Ninth District of California for his valued contribution to this exposition of the merits of our beloved State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

All time on this section has expired.

The Clerk will read the committee amendment.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MASON moves that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MASON) there were—ayes 44, noes 115.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment on page 16.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: page 16, line 19:

"MAXIMUM USE OF EXISTING GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AND FACILITIES

"SEC. 703. In carrying on activities under this act which requires the utilization of Government property and facilities, maximum use shall be made of existing Government property and facilities."

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as time is being utilized today in the creation of a State admiration society, and having heard the excellent remarks of the gentlemen from California and Pennsylvania, I, coming from the great State of Illinois, might as well join the parade by reminding you that Illinois has in it the city of Chicago, the flower of the universe.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the point of order and I want to be heard on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Can we not be heard in support of or in opposition to the point of order? The gentleman wants to talk about Chicago?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, my statement is in order, because I am rising in defense of Illinois. When this matter first came to the floor 2 weeks ago I was not on the floor. I came on the floor the following Tuesday afternoon. I had in the meantime read the report, the bill and the hearings, and after listening to the debate I made a statement with reference to this bill. The following Sunday there appeared certain statements in the newspaper directly charging me and other Members from Illinois with being isolationists. That same afternoon I heard my name again mentioned. It was stated that I and the other isolationist Members of Illinois were holding up consideration of the bill. The following morning I saw an article in the paper, the Washington Post, again stating that the Members from Illinois were holding up this bill, engaged in a concerted plot to resist it, at least, that that was the theory of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That was stated right in the article. I want the members of that committee to answer what I have asked them many times before: Is the word "isolationist" the antonym of the word interventionist? They would have to

answer that it is. That being so, if I am going to be charged with either being an interventionist or isolationist, I shall choose the latter every day of the week. They can intervene all they want in the affairs of other nations. That is what is being done by this bill. But they should not attempt to cast odium upon those who honestly oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said before, if we are going to spend the money of America in other places, let us watch carefully as to what we are doing with it in this Nation. We have bills pending providing aid to education and for other needed support in our own country and the very people who are asking for that aid are those who would be willing to send our money over to other nations, money that should stay here. The portion of the bill just read says: "In carrying on activities under this act which require the utilization of Government property and facilities, maximum use shall be made of existing Government property and facilities."

I say to the committee that it had better check into what is being done with the property and facilities of this Nation in foreign countries right now. There are certain men who are assistants to the assistant to the assistant of the Secretary of State who by one stroke of the pen are depriving people of the things that they should have over there and by the same stroke of the pen they are spending hundreds of millions of dollars of our money without our having one thing to say about it. I can give you absolute proof of that fact. Instead of charging the Members from Illinois, who are trying to do their best here, with isolationism, they ought to look into these other things. When I first came here in the consideration of this bill I had not spoken with one Member of the Illinois delegation nor any other Member concerning this matter. I addressed the committee from my own knowledge of the bill and what is contained in it and what I heard in the debate. When the committee charges us with being isolationists, and charge us with being opposed to this, and in view of the fact that the newspapers state that the basis for the remarks came from the committee, I think the members of that committee should respond.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I know the gentleman comes from Chicago, one of the great metropolises of all the world, one of the leading cities of the world. I know that if the people of Chicago heard him today they would be proud of the stand he is taking.

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I voted to strike out the enacting clause. I voted for all the amendments on this bill with some realization that if we take seriously that we are in an atomic age, and that the next war will be fought with atomic power, most of what we have been doing to prepare ourselves for defense is probably wasted. Most of the ten to eleven billion dollars that we have appropriated for the usual armaments along traditional lines we feel in our hearts even now probably to be useless.

It is likely that we have not accepted seriously the atomic age and the atomic power. If we do accept it, then our only defense is the defense of ideas, and that is all. We have got to send, somehow or other, ideas to the people who may attack us; ideas that are better than warfare. Those ideas have to do with how to raise food in the countries where the people are striving. We cannot go on appropriating funds to feed them only to find that when we stop feeding them, their anger rises against us. They must take care of themselves.

We have, therefore, it seems to me, come to the place where the dissemination of ideas is about our only resort. If that is true, then the spending of \$10,000,000 or \$20,000,000 or \$35,000,000 is not a crippling undertaking compared to the reliance that we have on billions of dollars, probably, for useless defense. I made up my mind as a result of this debate that we must face it. We have a board now of our own citizens, a bipartisan board, to set forth the ideas that freedom does work at home; that it is the source of food, of houses, and of health, and also must be the source abroad, if they will only take it. If they do accept they will be content at home; they will not drop bombs on us for our food and houses. They will destroy their own dictators and be at peace. If they keep the ideas they now have and the dictators they have, they will ride the bombs that we discovered and drop them upon us. That is the issue.

We had better go to work on ideas of freedom to show that the freedom that works here will work abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to participate in the debate on this bill. I sat through the four sessions during which we considered the bill and its various amendments, but in view of the turn that the debate has taken I do want to take these few minutes to place in the RECORD my conclusions as to this bill. I am going to vote for the bill when it comes to final passage.

Whenever a responsible Member of this House states that every official charged with our national defense and our national security and the future peace of this Nation tells us that they want certain legislation passed, I will waive any doubt I might have in my

mind as to certain provisions of the bill and vote for the bill.

This I do know, that the more the people of the world understand our Government and our people, and the more we understand the other peoples of the world, the better are the chances for peace. As I understand it, that is the purpose of this bill. I have confidence enough in Secretary Marshall to believe that the bill will be administered in such a way that that program will be carried out. Many Members of the House are not pleased with the way the program has been carried out in the past and neither am I, but I believe that, as the majority leader said at the time we considered the labor bill, this is but the first step in the legislative process. By the time the bill is ready to go to the President for his signature, it will be an improved bill. If it contributes one iota to increasing our chance for world peace, then I want to be recorded as favoring the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VIII—FUNDS PROVIDED BY OTHER SOURCES

REIMBURSEMENT

SEC. 801. The Secretary is authorized, when he finds it in the public interest, to request and accept reimbursement from any cooperating governmental or private source in a foreign country, or from State or local governmental institutions or private sources in the United States, for all or part of the expenses of any portion of the program undertaken hereunder. The amounts so received shall be credited to the then current and applicable appropriation available to the Secretary for carrying out the purposes of this act and shall be available for the purposes of such appropriation.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 17, line 4, strike out "is authorized" and insert "shall."

Line 5, strike out "to."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 17, in line 10, after "be", strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 11, 12, and 13, and insert the following: "covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, the only purpose of this amendment is to prevent the possibility of another revolving fund. The amendment would simply require that any reimbursements received as a result of this program shall be covered as miscellaneous receipts into the Treasury of the United States, thus preventing the re-use of these funds out of a revolving fund, and will require appropriations to be made by the Congress before such funds can be re-used.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's point fully. It was brought up during the hearings. When

we raised the question, we were assured that this language would take care of it. I respect the gentleman's judgment, however. He is rapidly developing a merited reputation as one of the most effective watchdogs of the Treasury. We want this legislation to do what he says his amendment provides and we are happy to accept his amendment in this connection. It is an additional safeguard which is meritorious and it makes doubly certain that the intent of the committee and of Congress will be completely and carefully carried out. I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I fear that we learn very little from the lessons of history. We seem to have lost sight of that great lesson following the First World War when we, having successfully completed our military mission, merely sat down and let the cumulative forces that lead to war pile up until we finally were thrust into another conflict of armed might—the greatest war of history. That, it seems to me, should have taught us that we must work constructively toward peace, just as in time of war we must exert our every fiber to the task of attaining ultimate victory.

Peace in this world cannot come to us by chance. As we look about us we can readily see that the earth is encompassed by clouds of fear and doubt, of uncertainty, of misunderstandings between nations. These unsavory conditions are seeds of war and must eventually lead to armed conflict unless something is done to destroy them. These fears, doubts, and misunderstandings do not automatically dissolve themselves, but must of necessity be obliterated by a definite and deliberate action. No one of us can possibly know just what road will lead to universal and permanent peace, for that road has never been traveled, but I am willing and anxious to travel the road which I believe will offer the greatest possibilities in that direction.

The program outlined in this bill offers tremendous possibilities for the dispelling of doubts and misunderstandings in foreign countries about the United States and vice versa. An iron curtain about the United States would be far more disastrous than such a curtain about the Soviet Union, for I am convinced that we have in our democratic system the ultimate hope for the world. We must sell it to the world, by letting the world know how it operates.

I received a letter from the superintendent of the Greenville, S. C., city schools. This letter is a glowing tribute to the international teacher exchange

plan in practical operation. The letter follows:

GREENVILLE CITY SCHOOLS,
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT,
Greenville, S. C., June 11, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRYSON: The purpose of this letter is to give you a little more information concerning the international teacher exchange plan in which the Greenville city schools have participated during the past year.

As I told you in the day letter forwarded yesterday, the British exchange teacher we have had this year was highly satisfactory. Because I am eager for you to know just how fortunate we considered ourselves in having her here, I am sending you a copy of a letter of recommendation prepared for her on May 29, a duplicate of which was sent to the director of the exchange.

The detailed information which I have received from the exchange committee leads me to believe that the teacher we are expecting during the coming year will be equally satisfactory. You perhaps know that teachers who are accepted for the exchange must be outstanding instructors with good recommendations. A great deal of information comes to the school systems involved before the teacher ever arrives. I am sure that no school system would be required to accept any person who appeared undesirable.

There seems to be some fear on the part of a few Congressmen that some of the teachers who come to the United States may act as foreign agitators. This is, of course, a possibility. There also is the possibility that some of our teachers may do a little agitating for some of our institutions and our way of life which, in the opinion of some people, would be a good thing. I hope any teachers we send believe in this country enough to speak well of it. Since we always send as many teachers abroad as we accept, I have an idea that the influence of the foreigners here will be pretty well counteracted by our teachers abroad.

Frankly, I have very little patience with Congressmen who oppose the plan. In a world such as ours is today, we need to do everything we can to see that there is more association with the peoples of other countries, not less. If the teachers who come into our schools attempt to spread undesirable propaganda or to behave in any improper manner, I am sure that we could appeal to exchange officials and secure their removal. There certainly is no point in sabotaging a splendid plan because we may get or send abroad one or two undesirable teachers.

Thank you for all your services in the past.

Yours respectfully,

W. F. LOGGINS,
Superintendent.

JUNE 11, 1947.

To Whom It May Concern:

It affords me real pleasure to have the opportunity to write a letter of recommendation for Miss Ethel Davis, British exchange teacher who has been in the Greenville city schools this year.

Miss Davis has been highly praised by her principal and fellow teachers for her ability as a teacher, for the fine relationship she has had with her pupils and coworkers, and for the ease with which she apparently has adjusted to all the differences which exist between the schools of Great Britain and the United States. Her principal naturally followed her work closely because he wanted to be helpful in every possible way, but he found that she required very little assistance. She is able, self-reliant, and has a good sense of humor.

Not only is Miss Davis an excellent teacher of elementary school children; her general information is outstanding. She is highly intelligent and well-informed. During the year I have found myself constantly amazed at the amount of information she has concerning many matters and have sometimes wondered if our American teachers know as much as she does about our Nation and world affairs.

No letter would be complete without some mention of the contribution Miss Davis has made to Greenville and surrounding communities. She is a charming public speaker and has given generously of her time to speak before professional, cultural, civic, and church groups. All who have heard her are delighted with her personally and are impressed with the things she has to say.

A Greenville newspaper columnist devoted part of a recent day's writing to her, stating, in part:

"If a survey were made, it probably would show that Miss Davis has made more speeches during the last 9 months than any other person in Greenville. Her fine sense of taste, her frankness and tolerance have made her a favorite in our city and young and old alike regret to see her return to her native England in the early future. Whatever person in England made such a wise choice as the selection of Miss Davis as an exchange teacher is due a vote of thanks from every one of the 107,000 persons of greater Greenville."

I think he has voiced the sentiments of all of us. Miss Davis has sold the teacher exchange plan to the people here.

I am delighted to recommend her unreservedly for any position she feels she is equipped to fill.

Yours truly,

W. F. LOGGINS,
Superintendent.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during all the years of my service in Congress I have consistently refrained from indulging in the slightest criticism of my associates. It is not my intention to be critical now. Far be it from me to question the motives of any Member of this body or to voice objection to his free expression of his informed views on any subject. I do, however, question such views when and if they are apparently based upon misinformation or inspired by prejudice.

Until now I have listened in silence to the long and frequently bitter debate upon the pending measure. In many respects it has been a remarkable and disappointing exhibition. As an informative discussion it has had but little appeal. On the other hand it has forced upon me the conclusion that much of the opposition to the bill under consideration stems from a lack of understanding of the intent and purpose of the measure and lack of appreciation of the vital necessity of the action it authorizes.

In addition to this, throughout the debate there has frequently been evidenced a partisan political prejudice against our State Department and all its works. Day after day we have heard what might well be termed unreasoning criticism directed at the Department—criticism so undeserved as to indicate that, to the minds of the critics, anything commended by our State Department should at once be subject to condemnation.

I hold no brief for any department of our Government. In my opinion the men who head our departments are amply able to take care of themselves,

and there is not one of them who, if given the privilege of the floor of this House, could not come here and answer his critics face to face with credit and honor to himself. Unfortunately he has not this privilege. An attack made upon him here can be answered only by silence, while his critic preens himself upon the courage of his performance.

Our Secretary of State and his assistants are today engaged in the performance of a task of unprecedented difficulty and importance. The difficulty of this task cannot be magnified—the results of a failure in performance cannot be measured. All of us know or should know that upon the success of these efforts depend the security of a distressed world. That success or failure may spell the difference between a continuation of democratic processes in government and the end, throughout the world, of all liberty and freedom. Success may mean peace—failure may mean war. Faced with this critical situation, who will say that the men of our Department of State should not be given the confidence and trust of the Nation they serve? Who will say that they should not be supplied with every instrumentality necessary to the success of their undertaking.

One of the questions raised by the bill now under consideration is whether or not there is need for continuation of the broadcasting program provided for in the measure. During the debate we have been told over and over again, and truthfully, that the Soviet Union has for many months been broadcasting a program designed to injure the United States of America and bring upon our country the hatred and contempt of the peoples of other nations. We are told that day after day and month after month the official broadcasting stations of the Russian Government have been, and are now, beaming to all countries in Europe and to other nations of the world, in the language of the peoples sought to be influenced, a mass of untruths, distorted information, garbled news, and false propaganda against our people and our Government. Day after day and night after night this insidious propaganda is being hammered into listeners in scores of countries over the globe.

Until the Voice of America came on the air not a word of denial or correction of the Russians' statements was heard. Not a single truth about America was uttered. Not a single voice was raised in our defense. Who is it who cannot foresee the results if we now become and remain silent? Our need for the Voice of America is great. It must not be silenced.

Now is the time when our great democratic Nation must be presented to the world in its true light, and not in the distorted image created by the Russian Communists. We know that the Russian objective is to undermine the Government of the United States and destroy all confidence of the world in our democratic form of government. They know that a lie, however incredible, if constantly repeated and unchallenged, will ultimately be accepted as the truth. This was the Hitler philosophy once; it

is the Russian policy now, and to carry it on the Soviet Government is spending on its broadcasting program more money than all other governments combined are spending for the same purpose. If the opponents of the pending bill have their way and defeat this measure, the field will be open for Russia to work her will with the peoples of the world.

The United States of America saved Russia from destruction. During World War II our ships, loaded with desperately needed materials of war, crowded the sea lanes leading to her shores. We drew upon our resources to arm, clothe, shelter, and feed her armies. We fed and clothed her noncombatant population. We gave without stint in order that she might have the strength to drive from her soil the invading armies of Hitler. Russia was made strong through the will and generosity of a free and democratic nation. Today, awakened to her power and strength, her Government is spending something like \$100,000,000 a year to tell the world that the United States of America is imperialistic, grasping, and domineering; that it threatens the security and freedom of all peoples and is endangering the peace of the world.

We cannot afford to let a campaign like that go on unrebuked and unchallenged. We cannot afford to keep silent. Our voices must be heard. The people of all countries must be told the truth. The prestige of our Nation is at stake and the interests of the American people demand the passage of the pending measure.

The bill under consideration provides a further answer to the problem we are facing. This is found in its provision for the exchange of students, skills, and information. It calls on the nations of the world for open doors, for a friendly exchange of the knowledge necessary to human progress. It will permit the youth of our country to visit other lands, to see their cities and towns, to enter their schools, to visit their homes, to mingle with their people, to learn to understand and to speak their language, to observe their habits and customs, to meet them face to face and to know them for what they are.

This bill, if passed, will bring the youth of other nations to America for the same purpose and grant to them the same privileges. Those who come here will visit our educational institutions, our museums, our libraries, our galleries of art. They will study in our colleges and universities. They will, as do those we send abroad, visit with us in our American homes and note our way of life. They will see democracy in action and learn at first hand the true meaning of freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

And, then, those who come here and those we send there will return to their respective homes carrying with them a new concept and understanding of each country and people they have visited. This new concept will be put into words—into friendly words—to enlighten those at home; and in every community from which a visitor was sent, there will grow and flourish a new respect of one people

for another—a friendly respect born of knowledge and understanding.

Now, more than at any time in its history, is it necessary for the United States to cultivate and win the friendship and cooperation of other nations. Russia's propaganda campaign against us has already been effective in many countries. If her broadcasted untruths became fixed in the minds for which they are intended, they will never be uprooted. They will grow, flourish, and expand into a deep distrust and hatred. Our world leadership will pass to another nation headed by an individual whose will is law and whose power is fear. If that time should come, we will again face the alternative of a loss of liberty and freedom or a war to preserve our most precious heritage—and this time we will face that crisis alone.

It is my earnest hope that this House will pass the measure now under consideration. Its passage will mean that the Voice of America will not be silenced and that a student-exchange program will be established. Both programs are needed instrumentalities for world-wide and a lasting peace.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, much has been said during the last hour or two about our veterans. Certainly, I yield to no man in this Chamber or in the country in my appreciation of the conduct of the veterans during the last war as well as during World War I. That being the case, and since that appreciation is unanimous on our part, it occurs to me that now is probably an appropriate time to ascertain who is for and who is against this bill.

First, the subcommittee which is in charge of it here held very extensive hearings and indulged in a unanimously favorable report to the full committee. Then, the full committee after mature consideration after the subcommittee had amended the bill very generously, and after a number of other amendments were made, unanimously reported the bill to the House.

On what did the members of the committee base their unanimous report? Who appeared for the bill? Among others, Secretary of State Marshall, Chief of Staff during the war; General Eisenhower, commander of the Allied Armies during the war, and present Chief of Staff; General Walter Bedell Smith, General Eisenhower's chief of staff during the war, and presently Ambassador to Russia who spoke not only with his war experience as a background but as an American diplomat now in one of the large foreign countries and who has heard this program, seen its activity, and observed the reaction.

Who else? The leadership of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Veterans of World War II.

That, my colleagues, I submit, includes practically all the veterans of the last war as well as of World War I. They unanimously, through their leaders, came to our committee and many of them spoke with experience, such as Marshall and Eisenhower. They not only unanimously approved this legislation but urged its enactment.

Who appeared against the bill? Despite the invitation which I personally heard extended by the chairman of the subcommittee, which was a very cordial invitation through the press, which was well represented, for anybody to appear in opposition, not one single person, my colleagues, appeared in opposition to the bill.

Now, who are you going to follow in casting your vote when the roll is called?

Are you going to follow the leadership of our veterans, General Marshall, General Eisenhower, and General Smith, and the leaders of all veterans' organizations, or are you going to cast your vote against what these illustrious patriots are all very positively convinced is for the best interests of the country we love because of the fact that you heard some rumor that your uncle's grandpa's niece's cousin's stepdaughter said that this bill was not good? On what are you going to base your vote? In reaching your conclusion, remember that while these soldiers brought this war to a glorious and successful conclusion, remember that the psychological warfare is still on, and remember, too, that the money proposed to be contributed toward the success of this warfare is some \$30,000,000, as against some \$300,000,000,000 spent during the war and many more billions that would be necessary to win another war, to say nothing of the hundreds of thousands of precious lives. Certainly, my colleagues, does not statesmanship, does not love of country, does not respect for these gentlemen who know whereof they speak demand that you stop, look, and listen?

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. The gentleman stated that the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars were sponsoring this bill. At what national convention did they state by any resolution that they were sponsoring it?

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman belongs to both organizations and he knows that between conventions their respective committees act for these bodies, and it was the executive committees which approved the resolution approving this bill, both the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I just wanted to say that as far as I am personally concerned, I am going to vote on this legislation as a result of my own study of it and I think every other Member has intelligence enough to study this bill and to come to a conclusion upon the bill, regardless of what anybody else may have told him.

Mr. JARMAN. I certainly commend the gentleman for voting on that basis and I hope that all others will do the same. If so, if they will really thoroughly familiarize themselves with the real bill, its purposes and its possibilities for accomplishment for our country, there will be no doubt whatever of its overwhelming passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request for time at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. All pro forma amendments are withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADVANCES OF FUNDS AND PROPERTY

SEC. 802. If any governmental, intergovernmental, or private source shall express the desire to provide funds, property, or services to be used by this Government, in whole or in part, for the expenses of any part of the program undertaken pursuant to this act, the Secretary is authorized, when he finds it in the public interest, to accept such funds, property, or services. Funds so received may be established as a trust fund or special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, to be available for reimbursement of appropriations or direct expenditure for the purposes and under the provisions of this Act. Any unexpended balance of the trust fund or special deposit account and other property received under this section and no longer required for the purposes for which provided shall be returned to the source providing the funds or property.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 17, line 14, strike out all of line 14 and all of section 802.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I may say that this amendment is prompted by some research into the problems that are presented in this bill in section 802. When I read the bill and studied it, I came to the conclusion that if this grant of authority were permitted to remain in this bill, it would be possible for a State Department, so inclined, to completely circumvent the will of the Congress of the United States, and to bypass the Appropriations Committee entirely and to accept voluntary grants and contributions from private agencies of one kind or another, to pay the expenses of carrying out a purely governmental function. That has been contrary to public policy ever since this Nation was established as a nation.

There has never been a time when an expenditure of money for such a purpose could be properly justified, or the acceptance of money for expenditure by the Government for a purely governmental purpose could be justified unless and until the Congress of the United States expressly gave its approval.

I have here as a result of research a great long list of acts passed by the Congress of the United States dealing with the acceptance of donations, and I do not find a single one that related to a situation such as is envisioned in this section 802.

I think it would be a dangerous thing to allow any private organization to go to the State Department and say: "Mr. Secretary, the Congress of the United States has refused to give you the amount of money that you want to carry on this program. We will give it to you and provide the money"; and he would have the right to accept it and to thumb his nose at the Congress and its control over appropriations.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the Members of the House that the gentleman from Wisconsin was thoughtful enough to come before our subcommittee to discuss this problem to which he has devoted a great amount of research in tracing down the genesis of these provisions to which he has referred.

This section is not basic to the legislation at all, and rather than take an unnecessary chance we have told him we will be happy to accept the amendment.

I wanted him, however, to give the explanation to the House. I thank him for it. It is a constructive amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

LOYALTY CHECK ON PERSONNEL

SEC. 901. No individual may be employed or assigned to duties under this act unless the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after such investigation as he deems necessary, certifies that, in his opinion, such individual is loyal to the United States and such employment or assignment is consistent with the security of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 18, line 8, after the figure "901", strike out the balance of the section and insert in lieu thereof the following: "No citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not now in the employ of the Government, may be employed or assigned to duties under this act unless the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after such investigation as he deems necessary, certifies that in his opinion such individual is loyal to the United States and that such employment or assignment to duties is consistent with the security of the United States: *Provided, however,* That any present employee of the Government, unless an unfavorable report as to such employee is rendered sooner by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may, without such certification, be employed or assigned to duties under this act for the period of 6 months from the date of its enactment. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. RICHARDS to the committee amendment: "No citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not now in the employ of the Government, may be employed or assigned to duties under this act until such individual has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Secretary of State: *Provided, however,* That any present employee of the Government, pending the report as to such employee by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may be employed or assigned to duties under this act for the period of 6 months from the date of its enactment. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this substitute amendment for

the consideration of the House because I think it my duty to do so.

Both section 901 and the committee amendment provide that no one may be employed under this act until he has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation from a loyalty and security standpoint.

In my humble opinion, so far, so good. I believe these people should be investigated, those coming in and those already there. If there are Communists or Communist sympathizers in this outfit, or in any other department of the Government, they should be and must be ruthlessly weeded out. There is no room in any department or agency of our Government for those who do not owe their allegiance solely and wholeheartedly to the United States.

As a matter of fact, there have been so many wild rumors about Communists boring into the State Department that I believe such an investigation would be welcomed by 99 percent of the employees there.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has the machinery, the experience, and the know-how to do this job. You already know that the President has requested scrutiny and screening of all Federal employees from the loyalty standpoint. Secretary of State Marshall, shortly after his return from Moscow, filed a specific request with the FBI that top priority be given investigation of employees in the State Department. Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Administration John E. Peurifoy realizing that a man in his position must be, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion, immediately upon his appointment some weeks ago requested that he himself be investigated by the FBI. There is no doubt what this investigation will reveal as to Mr. Peurifoy. I have known him for many years and his family all my life, and I can testify that he is able, trustworthy, and efficient, and that there is no man in Government service today more loyal to the United States Government and our way of life.

But the committee amendment goes too far. In addition to requiring an investigation by the FBI, it further provides that, before the Secretary of State can employ anyone, the Director of the FBI must certify "that, in his opinion, such individual is loyal to the United States and that such employment or assignment is consistent with the security of the United States."

So far as I know, no such requirement as to the employees of this or any other department of the Government has ever before been enacted into law.

My substitute amendment provides that the FBI is to investigate and report its findings to the Secretary of State, but strikes out the requirement as to certification.

I have not communicated with either Secretary Marshall or Mr. Hoover about this certification requirement. I am not authorized to speak for either of them. But I am certain that Mr. Hoover does not approve this requirement because it was never intended that the FBI have this super-power over the Secretary of State himself. The FBI is an investiga-

tive agency; it is a fact-finding body; it has peculiar facilities for making investigations. Its services are needed here. Its proper function is to investigate and present the facts to our courts and the departments of the Government. It may be assumed that the Secretary of State, to whom the results of FBI investigations are made known, will act for the best interest of this country. To assume otherwise would be to impugn the loyalty of the Secretary of State and his Assistant in Charge of Administration. To assume otherwise would be to admit a fatal weakness in our system of government.

I am strong for this bill. The true story of the United States must be carried to the world, if we are to be understood. Our democratic way of life must be championed in the forum of the world. Right now Russia is spending millions propagandizing the world on the virtues of the communistic state. We must combat this stuff or reap the whirlwind later on. We must combat it by doing everything possible to see that foreigners are told the truth. But we should do it through democratic processes.

This bill sets up the machinery for getting our story told. We want the world to know that this is a Government of free men; that the United States is not a police state and, with the help of God, will never be.

That being true, it is inconsistent and destructive of our purposes to allow to remain in this bill a provision which makes the Federal Bureau of Investigation a superpolice body with final say-so over the personnel and activities of the State Department. The provision of the committee amendment, if enacted into law, would in itself create in this country the germ of the police state, the very thing that this bill proposes to combat abroad. We would thereby help to create a Frankenstein which could finally destroy our democratic system and our way of life.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS to the substitute: In the substitute offered by Mr. RICHARDS, after the word "safe", line 5, insert "who shall certify that in his opinion such individual is loyal to the United States and that such employment or assignment to duty is consistent with the security of the United States."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee, because I would like to explain what is wrong with the approach that these two gentlemen are making to this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman choking off debate on this important bill when many Members have not had a chance to speak on the bill at all?

Mr. MUNDT. I scarcely think it has been choked off, but I will modify my request and make it 15 minutes if the gentleman cares to have some time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. My amendment to the substitute is designed to strengthen it and to meet some objections which I think might occur on the Republican side of the aisle. My amendment vests the obligation to certify in the Secretary of State, because I believe that the Members on the Republican side of the aisle want to be sure that in this particular program it should be somebody whom they have confidence in who will vouch for the loyalty and the security of the personnel involved. Under my amendment the Secretary of State is required to certify to the loyalty and security of each individual employee in the program.

I beg leave to inform the Committee why this entire proposal is important, although it is not in the main stream of the bill. The head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is not a Cabinet officer. He is an officer appointed by the Attorney General. The Secretary of State is a Cabinet officer, and of high rank. Yet, by what we are doing in the bill, we are saying that an officer of lower rank, in a bureau which is charged essentially with criminal investigation, has the power to bind the Secretary of State on a certification of the loyalty of important personnel in the Department of State; hardly an expression of confidence in the Secretary of State of the United States. Also as my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee from South Carolina so eloquently said, it opens the possibility of a political police bureau of our own. In the bill for relief assistance to Greece and Turkey we included a similar provision, but that provision called for no such certification by the FBI. It said only that a person "shall have been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Now, I yield to no one in my solicitude for the passage of this bill, and I would like to say a word while I am on my feet on two of the arguments that have been made here today about the bill.

We have been asked what is an antonym for isolationism. An antonym for isolationism is security, and I would like to give the gentleman three synonyms for isolationism—one is insecurity, the other is impracticability, and the third is unrealism. I cannot believe that anybody who went through the last war could still stand up here and claim to be an isolationist and find any virtue in that position.

One other point—a good deal has been made about the fact that a majority of the Republicans went through the middle aisle on a teller vote to shelve this bill, and that a minority of the Republicans supported the move to continue on with this bill, argue it out and come to a vote. But, I would like to point out that when the Greek-Turkish assistance bill was before this Committee, on the question of whether we were going to be isolationists or whether we were going to be realists, a majority of the Republicans who voted, 58 percent, voted to be realistic, voted aye, in recognition of the fact that national security was a part of world security and that the preservation

of freedom here required it to be fought for in places far removed from here.

I prefer to believe that what Republican Members want is a clarification of this bill; they want some amendments; they want a complete discussion. I refuse to believe that a majority will be so unrealistic as to want to kill this bill, finally. The Republicans were in the minority in the Congress for a long time, and it is because new men have come in that the Republicans are in the majority. Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that the great majority of the new men who received the mandate of the people in November 1946, realize the inseparability of foreign policy and the means for explaining it to the people of the world, and will vote "aye" when the roll is called on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that there is anything that I can add to the discussion of this bill. It occurs to me that at this time everyone should be given an opportunity to express himself. This is very important legislation. This is legislation dealing with the future of this country and the world. If I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, although I have not had a chance to study it—I just heard it read—it seems to me that the amendment ought to be adopted. I have no understanding of the amendment that was just offered by the gentleman from New York. It may be a good suggestion.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. All that it does is that it takes exactly the thought of the gentleman from South Carolina and gives the power of certification to the Secretary of State. The amendment as presented by the gentleman from South Carolina just states that the Secretary of State shall have a report of the investigation. My amendment requires in addition that the Secretary of State, after having that report from the FBI, shall certify.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. I very much appreciate the gentleman's remarks about this amendment. If I understood correctly what he said, he has a clear conception of what my amendment does.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I confess that I have not had any chance to study it, but it seems to me that it is a good amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. My substitute provides for an investigation by the FBI. It provides for a report from the FBI to the Secretary of State, but it cuts out the requirement for certification by the FBI to the Secretary of State before an employee can be added to the rolls of the State Department.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I see nothing wrong with that.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. The thing that strikes me with peculiar force is, Who is going to tell the Secretary of State or give him the facts with reference to these people that he may select? He has no personal knowledge of them. Will he get his information and his certification from some of those who are in that agency, that the President recently said he wanted \$50,000,000 to investigate and get rid of?

Mr. LECOMPTE. He will get his information from the FBI. That is one of the big departments in this Government and is one of the departments that stands high in the estimation of the American people.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman who now has the floor and also the gentleman from New York that the State Department is an important branch of the Government, tied into the Cabinet, and that the FBI is not, but I am not unmindful of the fact that the FBI is the investigating arm of the United States Government.

Mr. LECOMPTE. If we cannot depend on the FBI, on whom can we depend?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not propose to turn that arm of the Government over to the State Department. Further, the State Department is entrusted more than any other department of the Government with the welfare of the country. The employees of that Department should be investigated by the FBI before they are permitted to deal with the destinies of the United States.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I am confident that General Marshall does not want anybody in whom he does not have complete confidence.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. This is the way this situation appears to me. Nobody may be employed until after he has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Without the certification, Secretary Marshall then would take that report, and I cannot think that anyone in this House, having the faith and confidence in him that we do, would believe that Secretary Marshall would appoint to any position anybody upon whom the FBI had made an unfavorable report.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is the position I am trying to take, but I thought that was the purpose and the object of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is exactly it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. As near as I could understand it, that is what I thought should be written into the bill.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The committee is up against this hard situation, however. We know of instances where a Secretary of State has employed or continued in employment individuals on whom the FBI made distinctly unfavorable reports. Still they were retained in the State Department.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Was the Secretary of State conscious of that fact?

Mr. JUDD. Well, the FBI turned in an unfavorable report in one case and, I understand, the Secretary did not look at the report. If he had looked at the report of course he could not have employed the man; but for various reasons it apparently was thought that to discharge the man for his pro-Communist activities might get us into trouble with Russia so the man was continued in employment although there was reason to believe he was not working primarily in the interest of the United States.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have plenty of faith in Edgar Hoover, but I certainly do not have any more faith in Edgar Hoover than I have in George Marshall.

Mr. JUDD. Neither do I; but George Marshall is not in charge of investigating the activities of a given person, and Edgar Hoover is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize what the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from South Carolina have said. Really, when you require the FBI to report to the Secretary of State on an investigation of a proposed employee, as the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina would require, it is the same thing as requiring the FBI to report on his loyalty, because I, too, cannot conceive of Secretary of State Marshall employing anyone about whom he has received a report from the FBI that he is disloyal to this country.

Mr. Hoover does not want this. Just as in the case of the United Nations, if we continue, as has been attempted in the House, to load the United Nations with many things which it is not equipped to do, that is the easiest way to kill it. Similarly, if we continue to load duties on our FBI, it cannot continue to function on the high plane and with the efficiency that it has always operated heretofore. I repeat, Mr. Hoover does not wish to have this duty. No other law has ever been passed by Congress in which such a provision has been placed.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I, too, have every respect for Edgar Hoover, but I, too, do not wish to run any risk whatever, just as the gentleman from South Carolina does not wish to run the risk, of the possibility of an accusation from any foreign country or from any "pinkos" in our own country that we are tending toward an NKVD in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, we are carrying forward in this proposed amendment a program on which we are now embarked. We wrote it into the relief legislation and we wrote it into the Turkish-Greek Loan Act. In fact I was the author of the FBI protective amendments in both of those bills. We provided that employees dealing with certain aspects of our international affairs should be screened by the FBI. I think that is a sound and prudent policy.

We have put it in this bill in this fashion deliberately because we feel this is one of the great struggles in which our country is engaged in order to defeat the activities and efforts of Communists abroad. We want the people carrying out this new program to be free from suspicion. We want to put an end to the suspicions and rumors of which we have heard so much during this debate. We want these new employees to be audited and to be screened and to be examined and to be checked by the FBI and we want them affirmatively certified. We believe that Secretary of State Marshall will be happy to have that responsibility taken off his shoulders.

I have never had too much confidence, Mr. Chairman, in an audit of a bank which is made by the wife of a cashier in the bank. I think the FBI, being outside of the State Department, should have the responsibility of investigating. The State Department is not set up as an investigating agency. This is in line with legislation which I hope the House and Senate will enact before we adjourn which will establish throughout all Federal agencies that the FBI shall clear all Federal employees as to loyalty and also clear them in the matter of security for this country.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a negative vote on the proposals of both the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] for the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JARMAN) there were—ayes 65, noes 87.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

Sec. 902. If any provision of this act or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the question was raised as to the endorsement of this legislation by the American

Legion. I have in my hand a letter from John Thomas Taylor, director of the national legislative committee, in which he says:

The American Legion, at the meeting of the national executive committee held May 5-7, 1947, at Indianapolis, Ind., considered the situation relative to the dissemination of American information to countries overseas. Appreciating the seriousness of the situation and efforts of the State Department to remedy this, they adopted the attached resolution which I am enclosing for your information, with the request that it be included in your record of the hearings as the established position of the American Legion on this vital subject.

The hearings referred to in the letter relate to the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, which was considering this subject.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. In other words, the national executive committee of the American Legion acted on this matter after the issue came before the Congress?

Mr. GARY. And adopted this resolution. Yes.

RESOLUTION 97, NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., MAY 5-7, 1947

CONTINUED WORLD-WIDE DISSEMINATION OF THE OPERATION AND PROGRESS OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Whereas it is vitally necessary that the peoples of the world be fully and constantly informed of the operation and progress of American democracy and of the unselfish aims and purposes of the United States of America in opposing the encroachment of tyrannical and totalitarian ideologies by some nations beyond their own boundaries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the continuation of world-wide dissemination by our Government, through international radio, motion pictures, and otherwise, of the fundamental facts of the American form of government and way of life and of the basic character and objectives of our foreign policy.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. ELLIS. The resolution did not endorse this bill.

Mr. GARY. It endorsed the program which this bill provides for.

Mr. ELLIS. But it did not endorse H. R. 3342.

Mr. GARY. It endorsed the program which this bill provides for.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. MASON. And no one could endorse this bill now because no one knows what is in it.

Mr. GARY. I have read the resolution and the resolution speaks for itself.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. This committee, through its chairman, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], did receive a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars specifically approving this particular measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, for many days the opposition to H. R. 3342 has succeeded in successfully bottling up a final vote on what is to some of us a most important measure if the United States is to combat successfully the advance of other ideologies considered by us to be inimical to the self-interest and the safety of the United States.

H. R. 3342, regardless of what its critics may say, was drawn up in honesty and sincerity. After several days of the bitter debate, the members of the committee, who reported the bill with a surprising degree of unanimity of thought, are in no manner dismayed by the attack and are determined to bring the matter to a vote. As Henley said in his immortal *Invictus*:

In the fell clutch of circumstance,
I have not winced nor cried aloud;
Under the bludgeonings of chance,
My head is bloody but unbowed.

So it is with the collective head of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We offer no apologies for our convictions, nor are we prepared to sacrifice this bill to the demands of those who would use their prejudice against certain portions of it as a lever to collective bargaining. The committee, in the interest of some degree of harmony, has accepted amendments which have not had the effect of emasculating the measure. We are prepared to accept others, so long as the weapons of ideas which we unanimously urge are not dulled beyond the possibility of use.

Time does not permit the listing of those who support this measure throughout the country. Captains of industry, the press, the radio, educators, churchmen, veterans, and laymen have joined together in support of the principles herein set forth.

I should like particularly the attention of the Republican side of the House.

Joined to this national voice last week was that of the platform committee of the Young Republican Clubs, meeting in national convention in Milwaukee. I quote from the statement of principles adopted by the convention. Under the heading, "The United States and the world," the future Republican leaders of America stated:

We advocate effective opposition to the spread of communism and other totalitarian ideologies. We must have a positive, vibrant approach to the rest of the world which is designed to show our faith in the objectives and operation of our free institutions. This approach should be imple-

mented by educational programs for the purpose of informing others of the virtues of our way of life, and by a program of economic help for other nations to the end that they may be self-supporting.

That is the voice of the Young Republicans, now; it is not the Young Democrats; it is not the American Youth for Democracy; and it is not the Young Communists.

In short, the Young Republicans of the United States call for positive action, and for a vision which extends over and beyond their neighbor's cornfields.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I am sorry; I cannot.

Mr. HUBER. I do not like the reference to the National Youth outfit and the Young Communists.

Mr. JACKSON of California. The implementation of our foreign policy has changed materially since our forefathers stood before Concord Bridge and fired the shot heard "round the world," although some of the statements made in opposition to the measure under consideration would indicate that some minds are still muzzled loaded, and that some concepts of our present day relationships to the rest of the earth could well have been voiced on the quarterdeck of the Santa Maria, or on the poop deck of the Mayflower.

Mr. Chairman, this is 1947, in the era of the atom. Upon one thing all men of good conscience are agreed. The world, its great distances shortened from terms of days and months to terms better expressed in minutes, cannot survive against the unleashed atom. The bundles of currency saved by defeat of this measure will burn as furiously as any others in the hot fires of the next war.

The gentlemen in opposition claim realism as their guide, and economy as their shield. Today there is no realism in silence and no protection behind a shield of dollar signs. To paraphrase a famous line from the marriage ceremony, we must speak now or forever lose our peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In view of the doubt as to the type of personnel to be selected for these posts under this act, I think it is especially important that the veterans be given preference in the selection of such personnel. Millions of veterans served overseas in foreign countries and know conditions in those countries. I understand an amendment to this end will be introduced by a Member, the very able and distinguished chairman of the Civil Service Committee [Mr. REES], who is very thoroughly qualified to sponsor such an amendment.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 903. The Secretary may delegate, to such officers of the Government as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, any of the powers conferred upon him by this act to

extent that he finds such delegation to be in the interest of the purposes expressed in this act and the efficient administration of the programs undertaken pursuant to this act.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 19, strike out all of section 903.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, however the other Members of the House may feel, personally I am deeply grateful to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], who just spoke so eloquently and so enlighteningly a few moments ago. He remarked that some of us in our thinking apparently were loaded at the muzzle. Perhaps that is right. I would like to plead guilty to that, if he meant what I think he meant, but I will say to the gentleman from California that I am not so heavily loaded with foreign propaganda that I blow out at the breech all the time.

I regret that the gentleman from South Dakota, for whom I have great respect and admiration, raised the issue of isolationism or nationalism a little while ago; and as is so often the case with gentlemen who think as he apparently does, they make very little distinction between isolationism and a lack of patriotism. The internationalists seem to be thinking of ways we can hamper ourselves while aiding others—of the interests of other nations rather than of the welfare of the United States of America. We will let that stand as it is. The gentleman said that we should line up and do everything we can for all other nations. I most respectfully call his attention to a recent statement of a former President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, who certainly cannot be characterized as an isolationist. You will remember that President Hoover warned us not once in the last few months, but several times, that there is such a thing as expanding and extending our giving and lending program until after a while we will not only be unable to give or to aid other people but we will not have a shirt left to cover our own national back. Muzzle loading? Yes. Some of us from the Midwest are. And, after all, our freedom was won, and for many years maintained, by muzzle-loading ancestors who shot true and often with muzzle-loading guns; and if the present generation of breech-loading gentlemen who shoot foreign ideology all the time will do as well, our welfare will be assured.

We are wondering whether those who advocate day in and day out that we must give this, that, and the other to everyone all over the world, while taking from our own people, are finally going to get us into a condition where we will not be able to help anyone and will not be able to carry on for ourselves. I go to the statement made earlier in the day: When are we going to take an inventory and find out what we have? We have not a nickel in the bank, we have not a thing in the cupboard any more; we have been giving away until finally we will find ourselves stripped.

Let us take a glance at this section on page 12 which reads: "In carrying out

the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in addition to and not in limitation of the authority otherwise vested in him (1) in carrying out title II of this act, within the limitation of such appropriations as the Congress may provide, to make grants of money, services, or materials" to everybody.

Now, let us go over to the section I want to strike, section 903:

The Secretary may delegate, to such officers of the Government as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, any of the powers, conferred upon him by this act.

First, what do we do? Instead of controlling the money and the way it is to be spent, we delegate that power to the Secretary of State. Then we tell the Secretary of State that he can delegate any or all of those powers or any or all of the powers which we give him to spend every dollar which the Congress may appropriate to anyone that he may select. That is a second-degree delegation of authority. I have called your attention to the printing of money in Italy and Russia, which has to do, I presume, with the duties of Secretary of the Treasury. Here we are dealing with the Secretary of State and we authorize him to delegate all of the authority given by this bill. Do you think that is right?

I ask that that section, that second delegation of authority, that double delegation of authority, first to the Secretary of State and then by him to someone else, be cut out of the bill and that we at least have the good judgment to delegate authority only to the Secretary of State himself, not permit him to redelegate the authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I think I should say simply in connection with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], that if we were to adopt that, we would certainly cripple the State Department in its administration of the act and make it impossible for the Secretary of State to do an efficient job, because obviously the Secretary of State must delegate to other people not only in the State Department but outside of the State Department some of these functions. For example some of them will deal with the census bureaus of other countries.

Obviously you could not expect the Secretary of State to work with the census experts of another country. Some questions will deal with the problem of agriculture. A great many of them will deal with the problems of agriculture, I may say, since hunger is today a serious world problem, and surely the Secretary of State should be permitted to delegate to the people in the Department of Agriculture those portions of the program in which we work with specialists of other

lands from the standpoint of agricultural problems and the battle against starvation.

In addition to that, the educational exchange features will require the advice and cooperation of people in the Bureau of Education, so they are going to work in certain aspects of this matter. If we limit it to the Secretary of State and tie him down to his Department, without any delegation of authority inside or outside of his Department, obviously you phrase this legislation in such a way that it is unworkable, and it is unthinkable that this Congress is going to pass legislation with unworkable or crippling amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

SEC. 904. Nothing in this act shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure is prohibited by any other law of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 19, line 23, after "United States", insert a comma, and "or (2) is inconsistent with the security of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPEAL OF ACT OF MAY 25, 1938, AS AMENDED

SEC. 905. (a) The act of May 25, 1938, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary detail of United States employees, possessing special qualifications, to governments of American Republics and the Philippines, and for other purposes," as amended (52 Stat. 442; 53 Stat. 652), is hereby repealed.

(b) Existing Executive orders and regulations pertaining to the administration of such act of May 25, 1938, as amended, shall remain in effect until superseded by regulations prescribed under the provisions of this act.

(c) Any reference in the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), or in any other law, to provisions of such act of May 25, 1938, as amended, shall be construed to be applicable to the appropriate provisions of titles III and VIII of this act.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the extreme internationalists seem to think that any man who is opposed to feeding every lazy lout from Tokyo to Timbuctu out of the pockets of the American taxpayers is an isolationist. They seem to think that anyone who is in favor of looking out for the American people first is an isolationist, and subject to condemnation.

Now, let me tell you this, if you do not know it now, you will find it out—and I am speaking to Members on both sides—at least 75 percent of the American people are nationalists. They believe in the fundamental principles laid down by George Washington and Thomas Jefferson when they said that our foreign policy should be one of "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none."

That policy, if followed today, would make America the strongest and most powerful nation under the shining sun, but when you go off under the guise of carrying the Voice of America abroad and bring in legislation here that tears down our immigration laws, imports Communist professors, if you please, from behind the iron curtain, and violates every principle of the foreign policy Washington and Jefferson and the great leaders who founded this Republic believed in, you are not doing the country any good, and you are not carrying out the will of the American people.

I shall vote to recommit this bill in its present form to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in my opinion, if you pass it in its present form, it will be as dead as a dodo.

I do not believe it will ever again see the light of day. I am sure it would not if the Americans could have their way.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 9 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, like every other Member that is serious-minded I want to do the right thing about this piece of legislation, but I am tremendously confused. I do not know what is in it and nobody else who votes on this bill will know what is in it.

I noted in this morning's paper that certain agents of the Department of Agriculture went down to the National 4-H Club meeting yesterday and very earnestly and seriously told those 4-H boys and girls that any of them who possibly can should go to China to learn how to farm.

There was a time when foreigners came here to learn to study our methods, our manners, our ways, our religion, and so on, but since the New Deal has come into effect we have gone haywire and have been sending people out all over the world to learn foreign methods and to bring foreign methods here. Today when a foreigner comes to our shores we welcome him with open arms and he usually goes home with a loan that turns out to be a gift. It is said one of the recent visitors who addressed this House took along home \$4,800 for each word in his speech. I speak for much less. So to satisfy my conscience, with which I have to live, I am going to vote against this whole business. If they want to bring a bill in here that will take our information and our way of life to these countries to help them, all right, but if we are going to invite the world in here with their isms and their cock-eyed ways of doing things, I am against it, so I am going to vote "no," and I believe a majority of you will, and I believe all of you should.

The House did a good job with the President's veto in overriding it. The

message was inflammatory, weak, misleading, and very erroneous, and inconsistent as well as contradictory throughout. What the Senate will do remains to be seen. I am told that the 15 Democratic Senators who voted against it were summoned to the White House for lunch with the President today. That really is turning on the heat.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call to the attention of the House that we are \$260,000,000,000 in the hole. A million dollars is a thousand thousand dollars, and a billion dollars is a thousand million. We owe two hundred and sixty thousand million dollars that the American taxpayer eventually must pay. Now the State Department is developing programs for bigger and better spending; as my good friend and colleague would say, "Where are we going to get the money?"

I hold here an article by Walter Trohan which reads as follows:

UNITED STATES CONDUCTING PROPAGANDA FOR GLOBAL SPENDING

The State Department is conducting an undercover campaign to win support for its dollar-spending foreign policy.

The diplomats are holding a series of off-the-record seminars on foreign affairs for "influential" citizens only. The meetings are being held in Washington and around the country. The persons of influence, as they are characterized by State Department protocol, are being brought to Washington at Government expense.

The "influential" citizens attending the conferences are told by the State Department they have been selected because they are regarded as molders of opinion and leaders in their communities for support of the Department's foreign policy.

The Truman doctrine is being explained to representatives of women's clubs, church groups, fraternal organizations, and independent voters' leagues as well as individuals of standing in various communities. These include ministers, doctors, and lawyers.

The press is barred from the propaganda meetings.

I repeat, the press is barred from the propaganda meetings.

It is said that the secrecy is calculated to impress those invited and win them over to support of the Department on the theory that they are being initiated into inside secrets, when all they are getting is a rehashing of global-spending diplomacy.

At a 3-day meeting early this month—

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Not at this point.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I plead with the gentleman to yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I decline to yield to my very dear and able friend from Pittsburgh.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, Pennsylvania, and the gentleman comes from the great city of Pittsburgh of which we Pennsylvanians are proud.

At a 3-day meeting early this month the State Department had 250 persons representing groups of a total membership of 75,000,000 persons.

During the sessions, it was learned, the delegates were told the United States must give financial and political assistance around the world to stop Russia; that the State Department information program, now aground on congressional rocks, is necessary to save the world; that they must educate the general public to support the State Department; that President Truman is a great statesman; that General Marshall is a great diplomat, and that the State Department could use more money.

The wide range of organizations at the large meeting included representatives of the Southern Council of International Relations, the League of Women Voters, Community Discussion Council of Muncie, Ind., the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Southern Baptist public affairs committee, Junior Leagues of America, Daughters of the American Revolution, Girl Scouts, and the B'nai B'rith, which supports and maintains the antideflation league.

And yet in face of this information we are shipping thousands of barrels of oil and gasoline—right now from California to Russia—so I cannot see how we can ever stop Russia in this manner.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Not at this point.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Please.

Mr. GAVIN. Please. I have a high regard for my very dear friend, and I ask that he please permit me to continue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from the Secretary of State at the Clerk's desk which I would like to have read at this time since I believe it effectively replies to the statements made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and to some of the other arguments that we have heard this afternoon. It tells the House clearly in his own language, over his own personal signature, exactly and definitely what Secretary of State Marshall needs and desires in his efforts for peace. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the Clerk may read the letter so that no Member may be led into denying the Secretary of State the weapons for peace, which he needs, through any misunderstanding about what Mr. Marshall says these requirements actually are. A Member of Congress assumes a frightening burden indeed when he votes to disarm our emissaries of peace.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, June 19, 1947.

The Honorable KARL MUNDT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MUNDT: I learn from the Department's legislative counsel that the House is about to take final action on H. R. 3342, authorizing an international-information program and educational exchanges.

Since I appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee in support of this bill on May 17, Members of Congress have attributed to me a great variety of opinions concerning the bill. I want to make my position plain.

I consider American security to rest not only on our economic and political and military strength, but also on the strength of American ideas—on how well they are

presented abroad—and on how clearly we are understood abroad.

There is no question that some other nations are using ideas as weapons and distorting facts to fit their ideas. We do not propose to follow suit. But I am convinced that we must present ourselves clearly, candidly, and affirmatively if we are to achieve the kind of peace we believe in. I know from personal experience that we are grossly misunderstood or misrepresented in many parts of the world.

I gave your committee my view that the facts about the United States must be spread in various ways. In some countries we must rely largely on radio. In others, we use also the press or motion pictures or exchanges of students and books or the assignment of government advisers. All are important and must be used if we are to be successful. To remove any one of these activities from the bill would be a form of demobilization. Peace cannot be served by any rationing of American facts or by limiting the methods for making them known.

I have informed committees of both Houses of Congress that authority for this type of program is necessary if the State Department is to fulfill its responsibilities to the President and the Nation. Without legislative authorization it has become almost impossible to recruit additional highly trained personnel to work on this program, either at home or abroad.

I am asking for the tools which are necessary to meet present circumstances in world affairs.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 20, line 17, insert:

"UTILIZATION OF PRIVATE AGENCIES

"Sec. 906. In carrying out the provisions of this act it shall be the duty of the Secretary to utilize, insofar as is practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, through contractual arrangements or otherwise.

"OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

"Sec. 907. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the establishment of any new Government agency; except that for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the Secretary is hereby authorized to establish in the Department of State an office to be known as the Office of Information and Educational Exchange.

"TERMINATION PURSUANT TO CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF CONGRESS

"Sec. 908. The authority granted under this act, or under any provision thereof, shall terminate whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress.

"REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"Sec. 909. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress semiannual reports of expenditures made and activities carried on under authority of this act."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 20, line 21, after the period, add a new sentence, as follows:

"It is the intent of Congress that the Secretary shall encourage participation in carrying out the purposes of this act by the maximum number of different private agencies in each field, consistent with the present or potential market for their services in each country."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]. As a result of the consideration given the matter of his subcommittee on appropriations when dealing with it, he and other members of that committee worked out this amendment. They discussed it with our committee, and we are perfectly agreeable to it. In essence it is this: It makes clear that it is the intent of Congress that the Department of State will always use private agencies, for example, the United Press and the Associated Press, whenever the market for their services in various countries is such as to permit those private agencies to carry on their informational activities.

The committee has no objection, and I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] may extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I have studied the bill which my colleague KARL MUNDT's subcommittee has devised for a foreign information program.

Surely most of the Members here present realize that many of their objections and questions are the kind which can be answered only on the basis of administration. The weeks of debate and criticism—both in the press and in the Congress—must by now have served to notify the President, the Secretary of State, and their subordinates of the kind of administration the people want in this program.

Certainly such a program must have checks on its administration—chief among which must be approval by the Appropriations Committee of each individual activity to be undertaken, and the fact that under terms of the bill the Congress itself can terminate the program upon 30 days' notice, should it so determine. These provisions are and should be much more stringent than those placed upon almost any other phase of governmental activity.

I sit on the subcommittee which handles appropriations for the State Department. We have to study these matters and make our recommendations to Congress. Because of this our attention has been directed to the fact that enormous numbers of Americans have foreign relations of their own through individuals, corporations, institutions, and other firms.

I should like at this time to direct the attention of the Members to this program as an attempt to utilize this latent talent and to organize it in an orderly way.

As the Members of this House may recall, I spoke at some length during the discussion of the House bill for State Department appropriations concerning the necessity of recognizing the strong part that private enterprise—the key-

stone of our American social-economic system—had to play in our international affairs. I would like to see the role of competitive private enterprise strengthened in this bill. For that reason, I have asked for these few minutes to discuss an amendment which I shall propose and which I already have submitted to the committee and which they have agreed to accept.

The present bill does make a provision for the use of privately owned facilities through contractual or other arrangements in carrying out the State Department program. I feel, however, that without amendment the bill does not provide for the fostering of competitive private agents. In fact, the present terms, if improperly administered, could tend to perpetuate a system whereby the present OIC has let contracts with such firms as the Radio Corp. of America and National Broadcasting Co. to produce programs at a profit without worrying about selling them to a customer. I can see why the heads of these great corporations, which only a few years back were forced to sell the Blue network under charges of monopoly, would see nothing wrong with that set-up.

However, I consider it most necessary to strengthen the position of pioneer independent broadcasters like World-Wide—WRUL—in competition with any Government "chosen instrument."

The possibility here sounds to me altogether too much like the bills recently discussed in Senate committees to set up a "chosen instrument" world air line. There, again, the president of the air line company which has most to gain through establishment of a Government-sponsored monopoly thought the idea was fine. I am given to understand there are a dozen or more other air-line operators who believe in and welcome competition and who do not agree with that point of view.

Competition is the backbone of the free-enterprise system. Any program of Government support in foreign commerce, whether it be in the information services, transportation, or any other phase, must and should be based upon the encouragement of more than one entry in each field.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Members of this House, and much less the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, will not want to find themselves in the position of approving Government-sponsored monopolies in the field of foreign commerce—while at the same time conducting a "trust-busting" campaign at home. The aim of the amendment I am proposing is that, through Government encouragement, competitive American enterprise will, as quickly as possible, be put in a position to "carry the ball."

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include four items—an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor for May 20 regarding the field for nongovernmental foreign broadcasting; an article from the same paper for May 21, outlining a definite program which is today successfully operating a privately owned international radio activity; a portion of

an announcement by the McGraw-Hill Co., published in the Washington Post for May 21, telling of that firm's recent expansion of its activities in foreign publishing; and an Associated Press dispatch from London, quoting a statement of W. Randolph Burgess, vice president of the National City Bank of New York, regarding the role of private investments in our foreign rehabilitation work.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 21, line 7, after the word "terminate", insert the following: "two years after it becomes law, or."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the committee will not accept this amendment. This amendment simply puts after the word "terminate", on line 7, "two years" when terminated by concurrent resolution. I submit to the membership of the House that all legislative procedures must come back to this House after 2 years for re-examination. What is wrong with that? I ask the chairman if he will not accept this amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. If I understand the gentleman's amendment, the committee cannot accept it. I believe he places a 2-year limitation on the bill. We placed "a concurrent resolution" in there so that the two Houses of Congress would be able to keep complete control of the legislation. Certainly we do not want to engage in a battle of ideas around the world and then announce to the world that we are doing it only on a 2-year basis. If as we proceed with this program we find portions of it not working effectively we can repeal them or the legislation as a whole by a concurrent resolution which can be presented at any time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not think you can cite any legislation that has ever been ended by a concurrent resolution of this Congress. It just is not done. Every agency, whether the RFC, the CCC, or the OPA, or any other agency has had to come back to the Congress and justify its existence every 2 years, and sometimes every year. I would like to see some legislation that is not going to be permanent, because in my own mind the State Department has one thought in mind and that is to build up a tremendous large agency that will go on and on and on and will never be terminated by concurrent resolution of this House.

So I submit to the membership that you should give this your honest and sincere consideration. I am sincere in offering this. I think it is only right and proper that an agency that has had so much controversy from both sides should come back and ask the Congress to justify its existence in 2 years. I saw an amendment offered a short time ago by a gentleman on the other side [Mr. RICHARDS], and it was a very close vote. Still there was complete disagreement as to the type of amendment. We have placed many amendments on this bill. I submit it is only right and proper that this agency should come back to Congress and justify its existence in 2 years,

and not leave it to a concurrent resolution of both Houses.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken; and on division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) there were—ayes 80, noes 112.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to inquire about the status of the legislation.

As I understand, the Clerk has read clear through to the conclusion of section 909 at the end of the bill, all of which following section 905 is part of the committee amendment, and that any portion of this committee amendment is now open to amendment. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. In view of that, Mr. Chairman, and the lateness of the hour, I think it would serve the convenience of a great many Members if we would defer the final vote on this legislation until Monday or Tuesday. This would still give opportunity for consideration of this amendment before the final vote next week. Reports have reached the committee that an objection would be raised to voting late today without having an engrossed copy of the bill before us and without Members having an opportunity to see the legislation in its present form. So no purpose is to be served by holding Members here longer this evening.

If this suggestion prevails, I am going to ask unanimous consent therefore, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of clarity and good legislation and in response to request that the entire bill as now amended be printed in the RECORD at this point so Members will have an opportunity to study it carefully between now and Monday and to inform themselves fully as to the exact contents of the legislation now that a number of important restrictive and regulatory new amendments have been agreed upon. By this method every Member will have full opportunity to study the many careful safeguards and controls included in this legislation which has now been divested of the features and phases to which Members have raised substantial objections.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The bill as amended reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE, OBJECTIVES, AND DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1947."

OBJECTIVES

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are to enable the Government of the United States to promote mutual understanding between the people of the United States and of other countries, which is one of the essential foundations of peace, and to correct misunderstandings about the United States in other countries. The means to be used in achieving these objectives are—

(1) the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills;

(2) the rendering of technical and other services to other countries on the basis of mutual cooperation; and

(3) the dissemination abroad of public information about the United States, its people and the principles and objectives of its Government;

(4) the dissemination abroad of public information about the United Nations, its organization and functions, and the participation of the United States as a member thereof.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. When used in this act, the term—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of State.

(2) "Department" means the Department of State.

(3) "Government agency" means any executive department, board, bureau, commission, or other agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or independent establishment, or any corporation wholly owned (either directly or through one or more corporations) by the United States.

TITLE II—INTERCHANGE OF PERSONS, KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

PERSONS

SEC. 201. The Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges, on a reciprocal basis, between the United States and other countries of students, trainees, teachers, guest instructors, professors, and leaders in fields of specialized knowledge or skill. The Secretary may provide for orientation courses and other appropriate services for such persons from other countries upon their arrival in the United States, and for such persons going to other countries from the United States. When any country fails or refuses to cooperate in such program on a basis of reciprocity, the Secretary shall terminate or limit such program, with respect to such country, to the extent he deems to be advisable in the interests of the United States. If the Secretary finds that any person from another country, while in the United States pursuant to this section, is engaged in activities of a political nature, or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States, the Secretary shall promptly report such finding to the Attorney General, and such person shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported.

BOOKS AND MATERIALS

SEC. 202. The Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges between the United States and other countries of books and periodicals, including government publications, for the translation of such writings, and for the preparation, distribution, and interchange of other educational materials.

INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 203. The Secretary is authorized to provide for assistance to schools, libraries, and community centers abroad, founded or sponsored by citizens of the United States, or serving as demonstration centers for methods and practices employed in the United States. In assisting any such schools, however, the Secretary shall exercise no control over their educational policies and shall in no case furnish assistance of any character which is not in keeping with the free democratic principles and the established foreign policy of the United States.

TITLE III—ASSIGNMENT OF SPECIALISTS

PERSONS TO BE ASSIGNED

SEC. 301. The Secretary is authorized, when the government of another country is desirous of obtaining the services of a person having special scientific or other technical or professional qualifications, from time to time to assign or authorize the assignment for service, to or in cooperation with such gov-

ernment, any person in the employ or service of the Government of the United States who has such qualifications, with the approval of the Government agency in which such person is employed or serving. Nothing in this act, however, shall authorize the assignment of such personnel for service relating to the organization, training, operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government.

STATUS AND ALLOWANCES

SEC. 302. Any person, while assigned for service to or in cooperation with another government under the authority of this act, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his rights, allowances, and privileges as such, an officer or employee of the Government of the United States and of the Government agency from which assigned and he shall continue to receive compensation from that agency. He may also receive, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, representation allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999). The authorization of such allowances and other benefits and the payment thereof out of any appropriations available therefor shall be considered as meeting all the requirements of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes.

ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE UNDER ANOTHER GOVERNMENT

SEC. 303. Any person while assigned for service to or in cooperation with another government under authority of this act may, at the discretion of his Government agency, with the concurrence of the Secretary, and without additional compensation therefor, accept an office under the government to which he is assigned, if the acceptance of such an office in the opinion of such agency is necessary to permit the effective performance of duties for which he is assigned, including the making or approving on behalf of such foreign government the disbursement of funds provided by such government or of receiving from such foreign government funds for deposit and disbursement on behalf of such government, in carrying out programs undertaken pursuant to this act: *Provided, however*, That such acceptance of office shall in no case involve the taking of an oath of allegiance to another government.

TITLE IV—PARTICIPATION BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

GENERAL AUTHORITY

SEC. 401. The Secretary is authorized, in carrying on any activity under the authority of this act, to utilize, with their approval, the services, facilities, and personnel of the other Government agencies. Whenever the Secretary shall use the services, facilities, or personnel of any Government agency for activities under authority of this act, the Secretary shall pay for such performance out of funds available to the Secretary under this act, either in advance, by reimbursement, or direct transfer. In utilizing the Government agencies, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the best available and qualified Government services, facilities, and personnel shall be sought, in order to ensure professional competence and avoid duplication; and (2) that the Secretary shall consult the appropriate technical agencies of the Government concerning any activity authorized by titles II, III, and IV of this act which comes within the competence of such agencies.

TECHNICAL AND OTHER SERVICES

SEC. 402. A Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, may perform such technical or other services as such agency may be competent to render for the government of another country desirous of obtaining such services, upon terms and conditions which are satisfactory to the Secretary and to the head of the Government agency, when it is determined by the Secretary that such

services will contribute to the purposes of this act. However, nothing in this act shall authorize the performance of services relating to the organization, training, operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government.

POLICY GOVERNING SERVICES

SEC. 403. In authorizing the performance of technical and other services under this title, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the Secretary shall encourage through the Government agency with appropriate legislative authority the performance of such services to foreign governments by qualified private American individuals and agencies; (2) that if such services are rendered by a Government agency, they shall demonstrate the technical accomplishments of the United States, such services being of an advisory, investigative, or instructional nature, or a demonstration of a technical process; (3) that such services shall not include the construction of public works or the supervision of the construction of public works, and that, under authority of this act, a Government agency shall render engineering services related to public works only when the Secretary shall determine that the national interest demands the rendering of such services by a Government agency, but this policy shall not be interpreted to preclude the assignment of individual specialists as advisers to other governments as provided under title III of this act, together with such incidental assistance as may be necessary for the accomplishment of their individual assignments; (4) that such services shall not be undertaken for a foreign government if, in the opinion of the head of the Government agency, such services will impair the fulfillment of domestic responsibilities of that agency; and (5) that the Department shall invite outstanding leaders in the United States, both within and outside the Federal Government, in the various fields of activity covered by this title, to review and extend advice on the Secretary's policies in rendering technical and other services to another government pursuant to this title.

TRAINING

SEC. 404. Any Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, is authorized to provide to citizens of other countries, and to citizens of the United States going to other countries in connection with the carrying out of this act, technical and other training within the fields in which such agency has competence, or to provide for such training through State and local governmental agencies or private institutions and organizations.

INTERCHANGE OF SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

SEC. 405. A Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, is authorized to promote the interchange with other countries of scientific and specialized knowledge and skills, within the fields in which such agency has competence, through publications and other scientific and educational materials.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION

SEC. 406. In order that the activities of Government agencies authorized by titles II, III, and IV of this act may be effectively coordinated and interdepartmental relationships as authorized by this act may be clearly defined, the Secretary may establish upon direction of the President an interdepartmental committee to advise the Secretary on the development and administration of these activities.

TITLE V—DISSEMINATING INFORMATION ABOUT THE UNITED STATES ABROAD

GENERAL AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 501. The Secretary is authorized, when he finds it appropriate, to provide for the preparation, and dissemination abroad, of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, through press, publica-

tions, radio, motion pictures, and other information media, and through information centers and instructors abroad. All such press releases and radio scripts shall in the English language be made available to press associations, newspapermen, radio systems, and stations in the United States and to Members of the Congress of the United States upon request, within 15 days after release as information abroad.

POLICIES GOVERNING INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

SEC. 502. In authorizing international information activities under this act, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the Secretary shall encourage and facilitate by appropriate means the dissemination abroad of information about the United States by private American individuals and agencies, shall supplement such private information dissemination where necessary, and shall reduce such Government information activities whenever corresponding private information dissemination is found to be adequate; (2) that nothing in this act shall be construed to give the Department a monopoly in the production or sponsorship on the air of short-wave broadcasting programs, or a monopoly in any other medium of information; (3) that the Department shall invite outstanding private leaders of the United States in cultural and informational fields to review and extend advice on the Government's international information activities; and (4) that all printed matter, films, broadcasts, and other materials in the fields of mass media shall, when disseminated by the Government, be identified as to Government or private source.

TITLE VI—ADVISORY COMMISSION TO FORMULATE POLICIES

FORMULATION OF POLICIES

SEC. 601. There is hereby created a United States Information and Educational Exchange Advisory Commission (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Commission") to be constituted as provided in section 602. The Commission shall formulate and present to the Secretary of State the policies to be followed and adhered to in connection with the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills, the assignment of specialists, the preparation and dissemination of information about the United States, its people and its policies, and the carrying out of the other provisions of this act.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 602. (a) The Commission shall consist of 11 members, not more than 6 of whom shall be from any one political party, as follows: (1) Ten members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and (2) the Secretary of State or such officer in the State Department as may be designated by such Secretary.

(b) The members of the Commission shall represent the public interest, but of the persons appointed under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section, one shall be selected from among educators, one from among individuals formerly in active service in the armed forces of the United States, one from representatives of labor, one farmer, one from the newspaper business, one from the motion-picture industry, one from the radio industry, and three from persons having general business experience. All persons so appointed shall be persons of national reputations in their respective fields. No person holding any compensated Federal or State office shall be eligible for appointment under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section.

(c) The term of each member appointed under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be 3 years except that the terms of office of such members first taking office on the Commission shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, three at the end of 1 year, three at

the end of 2 years, and three at the end of 3 years from the date of the enactment of this act. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor is appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Upon the expiration of his term of office any member may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

(d) The President shall designate a chairman and a vice chairman from among members of the Commission.

(e) The members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services as such members but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel and subsistence in connection with attendance of meetings of the Commission away from their places of residence.

(f) The Commission is authorized to adopt such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary to carry out the authority conferred upon it by this title.

(g) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such clerical assistants as may be necessary in carrying out the provisions of this title.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

SEC. 603. The Commission shall meet not less frequently than once each month and shall, from time to time, prepare and transmit to the secretary and to the Congress its recommendations for carrying out the various activities authorized by this act, and shall submit to the Congress a quarterly report of all programs and activities recommended by it under this act and the action taken to carry out such recommendations.

TITLE VII—APPROPRIATIONS

GENERAL AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 701. Appropriations to carry out the purposes of this act are hereby authorized.

TRANSFERS OF FUNDS

SEC. 702. The Secretary may authorize the transfer to other Government agencies for expenditure in the United States and in other countries, in order to carry out the purposes of this act, any part of any appropriations available to the Department for carrying out the purposes of this act, for direct expenditure or as a working fund, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority contained in this act or under the authority governing the activities of the Government agency to which a part of any such appropriation is transferred, provided the activities come within the scope of this act.

TITLE VIII—ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

THE SECRETARY

SEC. 801. In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in addition to and not in limitation of the authority otherwise vested in him—

(1) In carrying out title II of this act, within the limitation of such appropriations as the Congress may provide, to make grants of money, services, or materials to State and local governmental institutions in the United States, to governmental institutions in other countries, and to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations both in the United States and in other countries;

(2) to furnish, sell, or rent, by contract or otherwise, educational and information materials and equipment for dissemination to, or use by, peoples of foreign countries;

(3) whenever necessary in carrying out title V of this act, to purchase, rent, construct, improve, maintain, and operate facilities for radio transmission and reception, including the leasing of real property both within and without the continental limits of the United States for periods not to exceed 10 years, or for longer periods if provided for by the appropriation act;

(4) to provide for printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States, without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111);

(5) to employ without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, when such employment is provided for by the appropriation act, (i) persons on a temporary basis, and (ii) aliens within the United States, but such employment of aliens shall be limited to services related to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages when suitably qualified United States citizens are not available; and

(6) to create such advisory committees as the Secretary may decide to be of assistance in formulating his policies for carrying out the purposes of this act. No committee member shall be allowed any salary or other compensation for services; but he may be paid his actual transportation expenses, and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, while away from his home in attendance upon meetings within the United States or in consultation with the Department under instructions.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 802. In carrying on activities which further the purposes of this act, subject to approval of such activities by the Secretary, the Department and the other Government agencies are authorized—

(1) to place orders and make purchases and rentals of materials and equipment;

(2) to make contracts, including contracts with governmental agencies, foreign or domestic, including subdivisions thereof, and intergovernmental organizations of which the United States is a member, and, with respect to contracts entered into in foreign countries, without regard to section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22);

(3) under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to pay the transportation expenses, and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, of citizens or subjects of other countries, without regard to the standardized Government travel regulations and the Subsistence Act of 1926, as amended;

(4) to make grants for, and to pay expenses incident to, training and study; and

MAXIMUM USE OF EXISTING GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AND FACILITIES

SEC. 803. In carrying on activities under this act which require the utilization of Government property and facilities, maximum use shall be made of existing Government property and facilities.

TITLE IX—FUNDS PROVIDED BY OTHER SOURCES

REIMBURSEMENT

SEC. 901. The Secretary shall, when he finds it in the public interest, request and accept reimbursement from any cooperating governmental or private source in a foreign country, or from State or local governmental institutions or private sources in the United States, for all or part of the expenses of any portion of the program undertaken hereunder. The amount so received shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS

LOYALTY CHECK ON PERSONNEL

SEC. 1001. No citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not now in the employ of the Government, may be employed or assigned to duties under this act unless the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after such investigation as he deems necessary, certifies that in his opinion such individual is loyal to the United States and that such employment or assignment to duties is consistent with the security of the United States: *Provided, however,* That any present employee of the Government, unless an unfavorable report as to such employee is rendered sooner by the Federal Bureau of In-

vestigation, may, without such certification, be employed or assigned to duties under this act for the period of 6 months from the date of its enactment. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 1002. If any provision of this act or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 1003. The Secretary may delegate, to such officers of the Government as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, any of the powers conferred upon him by this act to the extent that he finds such delegation to be in the interest of the purposes expressed in this act and the efficient administration of the programs undertaken pursuant to this act.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

SEC. 1004. Nothing in this act shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure (1) is prohibited by any other law of the United States, or (2) is inconsistent with the security of the United States.

REPEAL OF ACT OF MAY 25, 1938, AS AMENDED

SEC. 1005. (a) The act of May 25, 1938, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary detail of United States employees, possessing special qualifications, to governments of American Republics and the Philippines, and for other purposes," as amended (52 Stat. 442; 53 Stat. 652), is hereby repealed.

(b) Existing executive orders and regulations pertaining to the administration of such act of May 25, 1938, as amended, shall remain in effect until superseded by regulations prescribed under the provisions of this act.

(c) Any reference in the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), or in any other law, to provisions of such act of May 25, 1938, as amended, shall be construed to be applicable to the appropriate provisions of titles III and VIII of this act.

UTILIZATION OF PRIVATE AGENCIES

SEC. 1006. In carrying out the provisions of this act it shall be the duty of the Secretary to utilize, insofar as is practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, through contractual arrangements or otherwise.

It is the intent of Congress that the Secretary shall encourage participation in carrying out the purposes of this act by the maximum number of different private agencies in each field consistent with the present or potential market for their services in each country.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

SEC. 1007. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the establishment of any new Government agency; except that for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the Secretary is hereby authorized to establish in the Department of State an office to be known as the Office of Information and Educational Exchange.

TERMINATION PURSUANT TO CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF CONGRESS

SEC. 1008. The authority granted under this Act, or under any provision thereof, shall terminate whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 1009. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress semiannual reports of expenditures made and activities carried on under authority of this act.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record in two instances and to include in each extraneous matter, one extension being on the St. Lawrence waterway.

Mr. CARROLL (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial from yesterday's Washington Evening Star entitled "A Proper Veto."

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I recently obtained permission to extend my remarks and include certain extraneous matter. This has been returned to me by the Government Printer because it exceeded the limit. I am advised that the amount will be \$266.25. Notwithstanding that it exceeds the limit I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the RFC Extension Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record on the President's veto of the labor bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter from the State Department.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

TO CLARIFY THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this delivery is something in the nature of a post mortem. It is an attempt to shed some light on an issue which was summarily dismissed on this floor 2 days ago, an attempt to clarify the facts that bear upon this issue in order that the temperate Members of the other body may see the issue in its true light.

I am referring to the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3 and to House Concurrent Resolution No. 51, expressing disfavor with that plan, which was passed on the floor of this House 2 days ago without a great deal of notice and without the consideration which it so richly deserved.

Let us look briefly at the situation with which Reorganization Plan No. 3 attempted to deal.

Executive Order No. 9070, issued by the President on February 24, 1942, under the authority of the First War Powers Act, consolidated the Government's housing functions in a single administrative unit, the National Housing Agency. This action was made necessary by the war emergency, a state of affairs in which we could no longer afford the luxury of dispersion and lack of cohesiveness in the Nation's housing program.

The National Housing Agency proved its value in lending directivity and coordinated effectiveness to the field of housing. No one would deny that errors were made, but they were errors born of war confusion and of the novelty of large-scale administration in this field. In no way do these errors constitute a valid criticism of a policy of coordination

among the Government's housing activities.

At the present time, although the war is over, we are faced with a housing shortage of unprecedented magnitude. In order to deal with this shortage, the President has sought to maintain the consolidation of Federal housing activities in a single unit, a unit similar in most ways to the wartime National Housing Agency. In seeking to achieve this consolidation on a peacetime basis the President is only discharging the responsibility placed upon him by the Reorganization Act of 1945. Let me quote to you the six statements of congressional intent given in section 2 (a) of that act:

The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

(1) to facilitate orderly transition from war to peace;

(2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

(3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues;

(4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

(5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

(6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

When we look at the details of Reorganization Plan No. 3, we see that the plan can be supported in terms of all of these objectives.

In evaluating the effect of the plan, we must consider what would happen in its absence. If this plan is rejected in both Houses, the housing functions, now grouped in the National Housing Agency, would upon expiration of the First War Powers Act, revert to a total of five executive departments and agencies. Try to imagine the chaos, confusion, inefficiency, and expense that would result.

The Federal Housing Administration would revert to the Federal Loan Agency, an agency which exists only as a structural shell at the present time and which would have to be completely reconstituted as an administrative unit. The United States Housing Authority would revert to the Federal Works Agency, an agency unequipped at the present time to deal with the problems of slum clearance and low-cost housing control. The Defense Homes Corporation would revert to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The defense housing constructed under the authority of the Lanham Act would be turned over to the Federal Works Administrator. The defense housing, exclusive of military reservations, constructed by the Army and Navy before and during the war, would revert to the War and Navy Departments. The non-farm housing constructed by the Farm Security Administration, including the 3 "green" towns and some 30 rural proj-

ects, would revert to the Department of Agriculture. The Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation would all revert to the Federal Loan Agency.

The fantastic process of reversion described above, if allowed to materialize, would be twofold in its confoundedness.

In the first place it would be tremendously costly. There would be an initial expense of many millions of dollars necessary in reconstituting the various, separate administrative units required. There would be a continuing uneconomic expense necessary in maintaining these isolated, duplicating, and overlapping facilities in five departments and agencies scattered about the executive branch.

In the second place this process of reversion would rob the Government's housing programs of any semblance of coordination. No one man would be able to study the whole picture of the Nation's housing problem and meet that problem intelligently and effectively with a combination of the private-loan management and low-cost development facilities available to him. The segregated housing activities would be competing with each other for the support of Congress and the public.

Now let us see what Reorganization Plan No. 3 actually does. First of all it does not continue any function beyond the time set by law for its expiration. It does not, as has been alleged, make permanent any housing function which Congress did not establish as a permanent function.

The plan establishes a Housing and Home Finance Agency, with an administrator, to replace the present, tenuous National Housing Agency as the coordinating unit for Federal housing activities. Under this unit the plan establishes three constituents, each with a high degree of autonomy, as follows:

First. The Home Loan Bank Board, consisting of three members, to supervise the operation of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. The function of all of these activities is one of insuring investments in local savings and loan associations.

Second. The Federal Housing Administration, with a Commissioner, to exercise the functions of the present Federal Housing Administration. These functions are primarily concerned with the insurance of mortgage loans and loans without collateral security for the construction, remodeling, and repair of residential units and real property.

Third. The Public Housing Administration, with a commissioner, to control the United States Housing Authority, the Defense Homes Corporation, the defense housing constructed under the authority of the Lanham Act, and the general housing—referred to earlier—constructed by the Departments of War, Navy, and Agriculture. The functions of the Public Housing Administration are those of disposing of war housing and of

encouraging, where necessary, the clearance of slum areas and the construction of low-rent housing by means of capital loans and annual subsidies to aid local public housing agencies.

Finally, the plan establishes a National Housing Council to coordinate the work of the Housing and Home Finance Agency with that of other Executive departments and agencies concerned with the availability of housing. These other agencies include the Department of Agriculture, the Veterans' Administration, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

This, then, is what Reorganization Plan No. 3 proposes to do. To an unprejudiced student of the housing problem this seems like an eminently sane solution. Let us look at some of the objections of the plan.

A. Many critics of the Plan say that it does not lead to any economies. Consideration of the foregoing material shows clearly, however, that while the plan offers no great change from the present temporary structure, it avoids the tremendous expense of the reversion process that would be necessary in its absence.

B. There are those who feel that it would be dangerous—the word "socialistic" has even been used—to place the Government's home loan and mortgage insurance functions under the control of an administrator who was also concerned with slum clearance and the construction of low cost housing. These people hold the irrational fear that this man might be public housing conscious and that the home finance functions would be deliberately throttled.

This is an ingenious argument. Its invalidity becomes apparent upon examination, however.

In the first place, the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator are, and always will be, established by the Congress. The reliance which he places upon the various housing facets with which he works will be predetermined by law.

In the second place, and of even greater importance, the centralization of housing functions provided for in this plan effectuates the congressional principle already referred to in the Reorganization Act of 1945: "to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purpose." Certainly the major purpose here is the provision of adequate housing for the Nation. Those who advocate putting the Federal home-finance functions in a separate agency apparently consider the housing shortage as a fertile field for speculation in real-estate loans, rather than considering the home-finance functions as a really effective weapon with which to attack the housing shortage. This is tantamount to placing the cart before the horse.

C. Finally, it is contended in some quarters that the National Housing Agency was a wartime consolidation which has had no justification in the peacetime picture of government.

To refute this argument it is only necessary to study the recent history of housing in this country. Our present housing shortage is the result of stagnation in housing construction during the 1930's, stagnation that could have been overcome by sensible, long-range planning and the provision of financial incentives to private construction concerns.

We cannot afford to slip back into the chaos of a disintegrated housing program. It is necessary that a single administrative unit be able to control the entire picture, providing every possible inducement to private industry and carefully controlling the expenditure of public funds in those areas where private companies decline to operate—funds such as those envisaged in the Taft-Wagner-Elender bill. Only in this way can costly competition between the so-called private and public housing activities be kept under control, to the advantage of the country as a whole.

The real-estate lobbies—in particular, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the National Home and Property Owners' Foundation, and the National Association of Home Builders—object to Reorganization Plan No. 3, just as they objected to the continuation of effective rent control and the passage of the Taft-Wagner-Elender bill. These real-estate interests have a peculiar way of making their objections felt. Their batting average has been tragically high in this Congress.

They base their objection to this plan on the fact that it approaches the present housing shortage from the point of view of increasing the supply of housing in critical categories rather than from the point of view of speculating in the current demand.

These real-estate lobbies have been successful in defeating Reorganization Plan No. 3 in the House. The foregoing evaluation of the issue is offered here in the hope that the facts may be made clear and that this success will not be repeated in the other body.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. VINSON, for an indefinite period, on account of important business.

To Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM), for 2 days, on account of attending funeral.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Lecompte, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the

following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3203. An act relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 814. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

S. 1230. An act to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 19, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3792. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 23, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

817. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of various institutions and organizations which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

818. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to promote the national defense by increasing the membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Armed Services.

819. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its newly issued Electric Utility Depreciation Practices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

820. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 20, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Great Lakes connecting channels, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 11, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 335); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 15 illustrations.

821. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

822. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for administrative expenses of United States agencies incident to the liquidation of United States participation in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Adminis-

tration (H. Doc. No. 336); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

823. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision relating to an existing appropriation of the War Department (H. Doc. No. 337); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

824. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$3,370,000 for the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency (H. Doc. No. 338); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DEVITT: Committee on the Judiciary. Part II, minority views on H. R. 1639. A bill to amend the Employers' Liability Act so as to limit venue in actions brought in United States district courts or in State courts under such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 613). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TWYMAN: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 1821. A bill to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census; with amendments (Rept. No. 618). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3051. A bill to amend the act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 780; 34 U. S. C. 495a), and to amend section 2 and to repeal the profit-limitation and certain other limiting provisions of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503; 34 U. S. C. 495), as amended, relating to the construction of vessels and aircraft known as the Vinson-Trammell Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3888. A bill to provide increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VURSELL: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 221. Joint resolution to provide for permanent rates of postage on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3494. A bill to integrate certain personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and the Bureau of Customs into the Regular Coast Guard, to establish the permanent commissioned personnel strength of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3471. A bill to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 623). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3861. A bill to allow to a successor railroad corporation the benefits of certain carry-overs of a predecessor corporation for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; with amendments (Rept. No. 624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANDIS: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 3682. A bill to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments; with an amendment (Rept. No. 625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 3916. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and to extend the succession and certain lending powers and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 751. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2173. A bill to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3131. A bill to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BEALL: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3433. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 630). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3744. A bill to authorize the construction of a railroad siding in the vicinity of Franklin Street NE., District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3864. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act with respect to contribution rates after termination of military service; without amendment (Rept. No. 632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 3916. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and to extend the succession and certain

lending powers and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3917. A bill to amend section 5 (a) of the Farm Credit Act of August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 703); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 3918. A bill to amend section 201 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 3919. A bill to amend sections 812 and 861 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to allow the deduction of the amounts of bequests, legacies, devises, or transfers to or for the use of veterans' organizations in determining the net estates of decedents subject to Federal estate taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3920. A bill to exclude certain vendors of newspapers from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3921. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 3108 of the Internal Revenue Code (53 Stat. 359; 26 U. S. C. 3108 (c)) and the second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 3114 of the Internal Revenue Code (53 Stat. 360; 26 U. S. C. 3114 (a)); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3922. A bill to provide for the admission of certain former members of the armed forces to practice law in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 3923. A bill to authorize retroactive payment of compensation or pension barred because of capture, internment, or isolation by the enemy during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 3924. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3925. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to post-graduate schools of public health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 3926. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to designate the location of the offices of United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3927. A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, to authorize certain expenditures from the employees' compensation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3928. A bill to prescribe the measure of damages on account of trespass upon, unlawful use of, and unlawful enclosure of lands or resources owned or controlled by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3929. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional protection for owners of patents of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, as amended, so as to protect the United States in certain patent suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REEVES:

H. R. 3930. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, in relation to extensions made pursuant to wage earners' plans under chapter XIII of such act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to provide for permanent rates of postage on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. Res. 251. Resolution to provide that Members of the House of Representatives and officers shall, for their convenience, be furnished with identification cards; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 3931. A bill for the relief of James W. Keith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3932. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Bohm and Edith Bohm Staub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROHRBOUGH:

H. R. 3933. A bill for the relief of Rev. John C. Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

656. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mary Seeley and 23 other signers, all members of Battle Mountain Auxiliary, No. 1, United Spanish War Veterans, Hot Springs, S. Dak., requesting favorable consideration of H. R. 969 and H. R. 3516, which propose an increase in pensions of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

657. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Paralyzed Veterans Association of Bronx County, Bronx, N. Y., opposing any cut in the appropriation requested by General Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

658. Also, petition of the Human Relations Commission of the Protestant Church of the City of New York, urging (1) passage of the antilynching bill; (2) H. R. 2768, to create an Evacuation Claims Commission to adjudicate claims made by Japanese-Americans for losses incurred in the evacuation; and (3) H. R. 2933, to stay the deportation of persons excluded from naturalization because of race; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

659. By the SPEAKER: Petition of T. S. Kinney, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

660. Also, petition of Mrs. B. F. Crane, Zephyrhills, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

661. Also, petition of Mrs. Albina Bibeau, St. Petersburg, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

662. Also, petition of Mrs. Martha Moffitt, Sanford, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

663. Also, petition of Mrs. Carrie L. McManus, Sarasota, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 23, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, O Lord, that this land is still governed by the people's representatives. Let democratic processes be seen at their best in this time of testing. As these chosen men discharge their duties, guide them, O God, in the decisions they must make today. Give them the grace of humility, and shed now Thy guiding light into every mind. Break down every will that is stubborn against Thee or that has ignored Thee.

May what is done be so clearly right that it needs no incendiary justification. Soothe our still-smoldering hearts and minds with the spirit of forgiveness. Let us be swayed not by emotion or ambition but by calm conviction.

This we ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 20, and Saturday, June 21, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 20, 1947:

S. 321. An act to amend section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 so as to increase the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, and for other purposes.

On June 21, 1947:

S. 26. An act to make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape;

S. 50. An act for the relief of Joseph Ochrimowski;

S. 125. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters; and

S. 620. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Elma Franklin.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—VETO MESSAGE

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the